arXiv:1106.0912v1 [math.AP] 5 Jun 2011

BLOW UP DYNAMICS FOR SMOOTH EQUIVARIANT SOLUTIONS TO THE ENERGY CRITICAL SCHRÖDINGER MAP

FRANK MERLE, PIERRE RAPHAËL, AND IGOR RODNIANSKI

Abstract. We consider the energy critical Schrödinger map problem with the 2-sphere target for equivariant initial data of homotopy index $k = 1$. We show the existence of a codimension one set of smooth well localized initial data arbitrarily close to the ground state harmonic map in the energy critical norm, which generates finite time blow up solutions. We give a sharp description of the corresponding singularity formation which occurs by concentration of a universal bubble of energy.

1. **Introduction**

1.1. **Setting of the problem.**

We consider in this paper the energy critical Schrödinger map

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l} \partial_t u = u \wedge \Delta u, \\ u_{|t=0} = u_0 \in \dot{H}^1 \end{array}\right. \quad (t,x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^2, \quad u(t,x) \in \mathbb{S}^2. \tag{1.1}$$

This equation is related to the Landau-Lifschitz equation in ferromagnetism and it is a special case of the Schrödinger flow for maps from a Riemannian manifold into a Kähler manifold, see [11], [10]. It belongs to a class of geometric evolution equations [41], [30], [31], [44], [2], including wave maps and the harmonic heat flow, which have attracted a considerable attention in the past and more recently. The Hamiltonian structure of the problem implies conservation of the Dirichlet energy

$$E(u(t)) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u(t,x)|^2 dx = E(u_0) \tag{1.2}$$

which is moreover invariant under the action of symmetric transformations

$$u(t,x) \mapsto u_{\lambda,O}(t,x) = Ou(\frac{t}{\lambda^2}, \frac{x}{\lambda}), \quad (\lambda, O) \in \mathbb{R}_+^* \times \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{R}^3). \tag{1.3}$$

The problem of global existence of large data solutions or, on the contrary, the possibility of a finite blow up and singularity formation corresponding to a concentration of energy has been addressed recently in detail for the wave map problem – the wave analogue of (1.1) – and the Yang-Mills equations, see [43], [39], [20] for the large data wave map global regularity problem; [33] and references therein, [37], [21] (see also [41], [30] [31] [44], [12], [2] for the heat flow), and has been until now open for the Schrödinger map problem.

A specific class of solutions with additional symmetry preserved by the Schrödinger flow is given by k-equivariant maps, which take the form

$$u(t,x) = e^{k\theta R} \left| \begin{array}{l} u_1(t,r) \\ u_2(t,r) \\ u_3(t,r), \end{array}\right. \quad R = \left(\begin{array}{ccc} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right), \tag{1.4}$$

where (r,θ) are the polar coordinates on $\mathbb{R}^2$, and $k\in\mathbb{Z}^*$ is the homotopy degree of the map, explicitely:

$$k=\frac{1}{4\pi}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}(\partial_1 u\wedge\partial_2 u)\cdot u.$$

The k-equivariant harmonic map

$$Q_k=\left|\begin{array}{l}\frac{2r^k}{1+r^{2k}}\cos(k\theta)\\ \frac{2r^k}{1+r^{2k}}\sin(k\theta)\\ \frac{1-r^{2k}}{1+r^{2k}}\end{array}\right., \quad k\in\mathbb{Z} \tag{1.5}$$

is a stationary solution of the Schrödinger map equation. In a given homotopy class, Q_k minimizes the Dirichlet energy (1.2) with

$$E(Q_k)=4\pi|k|.$$

Moreover, a classical consequence of the Bogomol'nyi's factorization [8] is that, up to symmetries, Q_k is the global minimizer of E in a given k-equivariant homotopy class.

In the general case without k-equivariant symmetry local existence and uniqueness of smooth solutions goes back to [40], the small energy data global existence result is shown in ([6]) and a conditional global result for solutions with energy below that of the ground state Q_1 is given in [38].

For the k-equivariant problem, the Cauchy problem is well-posed in $\dot{H}^1$ if the energy E is sufficiently small, [9] or, more generally, if the energy E is sufficiently close to the minimum in a given homotopy class k, realized on a harmonic map $Q_k:\mathbb{R}^2\to\mathbb{S}^2$, [13] [14]. For large degree $k\geq 3$, this solution is stable, in fact, asymptotically stable by the result of Gustaffson, Nakanishi and Tsai [15]. For $k=1$ which corresponds to least energy maps, Bejenaru and Tataru [7] exhibit some instability mechanism of $Q\equiv Q_1$ in the scale invariant space $\dot{H}^1$.

1.2. **On energy critical geometric equations.** The Schrödinger map problem (1.1) can be rewritten by application of $u\wedge$ as

$$u\wedge\partial_t u=-\Delta u-|\nabla u|^2u,$$

and in this form it appears as the Schrödinger version of other energy critical geometric equations: the parabolic harmonic heat flow from crystal physics and ferromagnetism (see e. g. [2], [1] for an introduction to these class of problems):

$$\text{(Heat flow)}\quad\left\{\begin{array}{l}\partial_t u=\Delta u+|\nabla u|^2u\\ u_{t=0}=u_0\end{array}\right.\quad (t,x)\in\mathbb{R}_+\times\mathbb{R}^2,\ \ u(t,x)\in\mathcal{S}^2. \tag{1.6}$$

and the wave map problem (see eg [22], [33]):

$$\text{(Wave map)}\quad\left\{\begin{array}{l}\partial_{tt}u-\Delta u=(|\nabla u|^2-|\partial_t u|^2)u\\ u_{t=0}=u_0,\ \ \partial_t u_{|t=0}=u_1\end{array}\right.\quad (t,x)\in\times\mathbb{R}^2,\ \ u(t,x)\in\mathcal{S}^2. \tag{1.7}$$

For equations (1.6), (1.7) a special class of k-equivariant solutions arises from the co-rotational symmetry of degree k, where u takes the form

$$u(t,x)=\left|\begin{array}{l}\sin(\phi(t,r))\cos(k\theta),\\ \sin(\phi(t,r))\sin(k\theta)\\ \cos(\phi(t,r)\end{array}\right.\quad \text{i.e. } \ u_2(t,r)\equiv 0.$$

In this class the full problem reduces to a radially symmetric semilinear equation for the Euler angle $\phi(t,r)$. In a given homotopy class the harmonic map Q_k is also the least energy stationary solution.

and a general problem which has attracted a considerable attention for the past ten years is:

Describe the flow for initial data near Q_k.

In particular, the question of existence of singular dynamics for non trivial topology $|k| \geq 1$ has been the heart of important numerical, formal and rigorous works, see e.g. [3], [4], [2], [41], [42]. For all three problems, singularity formation, if occurs, is expected to lead to the bubbling off of a non trivial harmonic map. It is important to stress the significance of the $|k| = 1$ case which, due to the inner structure of Q_k, is expected to be the only case where *stable* singular dynamics could give insight into a mechanism of singularity formation for generic data near Q_k *without* symmetry.

In the parabolic case, the existence of blow up solutions for $k = 1$ is known, we refer to [2], [15], [1] for an introduction to the parabolic problem. Near Q_k, blow up is *ruled out* in [15] for $k \geq 3$ where the harmonic map is proved to be asymptotically stable, and an infinite time blow up is shown to exist for $k = 2$ emerging from slowing decaying at infinity initial data. The sharp description of the singularity formation for $k = 1$ is still mostly open.

For the (WM) problem, important progress have been made on the existence and description of the singularity formation in [37], [21], [33] where Q_k is shown to be unstable by blow up for all $k \geq 1$. In particular, [33] obtained a complete description of the *stable* blow up regime for the Wave Map problem (1.7) emerging from smooth well localized data with co-rotational symmetry, and for all homotopy numbers $k \geq 1$. The exact blow up speed in this regime is derived, and a conceptual connection is made with the singularity formation problem for the L^2 critical Nonlinear Schrödinger equation as studied by Merle and Raphaël, [23], [24], [25], [26], [27], see also Perelman [29].

For the Schrödinger map problem (1.1) under equivariant symmetry, blow up has been *ruled out* again for $k \geq 3$ in [15], [13], [14], where Q_k is shown to be asymptotically stable. For $k = 1$, Bejenaru and Tataru showed that Q_1 is stable under smooth well localized perturbation and also established instability of Q_1 in the $\dot{H}^1$ topology. This still leaves open the question of existence and stability of a singular dynamics.

1.3. Statement of the result.

Continuing the line of investigation started in [26], [33] for the nonlinear Schrödinger and wave map problems, we establish the existence of a finite time blow up regime for the $k = 1$ equivariant Schrödinger map problem together with sharp asymptotics on the singularity formation.

Theorem 1.1 (Existence and description of the blow up Schrödinger map dynamics for $k = 1$)**.** *There exists a set of smooth well localized 1-equivariant initial data with elements arbitrarily close to* $Q \equiv Q_1$ *in the* $\dot{H}^1$ *topology such that for all initial data in this set, the corresponding solution to* (1.1) *blows up in finite time. The singularity formation corresponds to the concentration of a universal bubble of energy in the scale invariant energy space:*

$$u(t,x) - e^{\Theta(t)R} Q\left(\frac{x}{\lambda(t)}\right) \to u^* \quad in \quad \dot{H}^1 \quad as \quad t \to T \tag{1.8}$$

for some parameters $(\lambda(t),\Theta(t))\in\mathcal{C}^1([0,T),\mathbb{R}_+^*\times\mathbb{R})$ *with the asymptotic behavior near blow up time:*

$$\lambda(t)=\kappa(u)\frac{T-t}{|\log(T-t)|^2}\left(1+o_{t\to T}(1)\right),\quad \kappa(u)>0, \tag{1.9}$$

$$\Theta(t)=\Theta(u)(1+o(1)),\quad \Theta(u)\in\mathbb{R}. \tag{1.10}$$

Moreover, there holds the propagation of regularity:

$$\Delta u^*\in L^2. \tag{1.11}$$

Comments on the result

1. Stability vs blow near Q: In [7], the authors in particular obtained the following statements. First, $\forall\varepsilon>0$, $\exists\delta>0$ such that $\|u_0-Q\|_{H^1}<\delta$ implies that the corresponding solution to (1.1) is globally defined and

$$\forall t\in\mathbb{R},\quad \|u(t)-Q\|_{\dot H^1}<\varepsilon.$$

Second, there exists $\varepsilon_0>0$ such that $\forall\delta>0$, there exists an initial data $u_{0,\delta}$ such that

$$\|u_{0,\delta}-Q\|_{\dot H^1}<\delta\ \text{ and }\ \exists t_\delta\ \text{ with }\ \|u_\delta(t_\delta)-Q\|_{\dot H^1}=\varepsilon_0.$$

In contrast to the first part of the statement above, which has the appearance of a result on stability of Q_1, the initial data considered in Theorem 1.1 are smooth, *large* in the inhomogneneous H^1 topology but arbitrarily close to Q in the homogeneous $\dot H^1$ topology, that is:

$$\|\nabla u_0-\nabla Q\|_{L^2}\ll 1\ \text{ but }\ \|u_0-Q\|_{L^2}\gtrsim 1.$$

2. On the instability on blow up by rotation: The blow up speed (1.9) is conjectured in [2] to accompany a *generic stable* singularity formation for the harmonic heat flow (1.6). The main result of this paper given by Theorem 1.1 shows that such a singularity formation regime also exists for the Schrödinger map flow, but it is no longer generic *due to a completely new instability mechanism generated by the coupling between the dynamics of the scaling and phase parameters*, see the strategy of the proof below. The rigorous derivation of *stable* blow up dynamics for $k=1$ co-rotational data for the harmonic heat flow with the blow up speed (1.9) is given in the forthcoming paper [34]. Moreover, while the blow up dynamics exhibited in [33], [34] for respectively the Wave Map and the Harmonic Heat flow are stable within the more restricted class of corotational symmetry, we expect the same instability mechanism by rotation freedom to occur for generic equivariant perturbations.

3. On the codimension one instability: The initial data in Theorem 1.1 are constructed to to form a set of codimension one in some weak sense to arrest the intrinsic instability of blow up dynamics induced by the rotation symmetry. Namely, given $0<b_0\ll 1$ and a smooth well localized and small enough [1] initial data v_0, we can find a parameter $a_0(b_0,v_0)$ such that the initial data

$$Q_{a_0(b_0,v_0),b_0}+v_0$$

generates a finite time blow up solution in the regime described by Theorem 1.1, where Q_{a_0,b_0} is a suitable small two parameters deformation[2] of Q_1. This relates to the construction of manifold of unstable blow up solutions performed in [5], [19],

---

[1] with respect to b_0

[2] see the strategy of the proof below

[28] for the L^2 critical NLS and [16] for the energy critical wave equation.

4. Propagation of regularity: The propagation of regularity (1.11) shows a major difference with the wave map problem [33] or the mass critical NLS problem [27], where the remainder is proved to barely belong to the scale invariant space, while a full derivative is propagated here. Using the estimates in this paper one could show that

$$\forall s>0, \quad \Delta^{1+s}u^* \notin L^2$$

and in this sense (1.11) is sharp, see again [27] for related properties. The regularity of the remainder is deeply connected to the blow up speed, see [27], [35] for a further discussion of a similar issue.

Notations: (r,θ) and (y,θ) with $r=\frac{y}{\lambda}$ and λ – the scaling parameter – will denote the polar coordinates on $\mathbb{R}^2$. We set

$$\partial_\tau = \frac{1}{r}\partial_\theta, \quad \Lambda f = y\cdot\nabla_y f, \quad Df = f + y\cdot\nabla f.$$

For a given parameter $b>0$ we introduce the scales

$$B_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{b}}, \quad B_1 = \frac{|\log b|}{\sqrt{b}}. \tag{1.12}$$

1.4. **Strategy of the proof.** In what follows we detail the main steps of the proof of Theorem 1.1.

step 1 Renormalization and choice of gauge.

Let $u(t,x)$ be a $k=1$ equivariant solution of the Schrödinger map flow, close to Q in the energy topology and potentially blowing up at $t=T$. By the local Cauchy theory and the variational characterization of Q it can be written in the form:

$$u(t,x) = e^{\Theta(t)R}(Q+\varepsilon)\left(t, \frac{r}{\lambda(t)}\right)$$

with

$$\|\varepsilon(t)\|_{\dot{H}^1} \ll 1 \text{ and } \lambda(t)\to 0 \text{ as } t\to T.$$

It is therefore natural to pass to a renormalized function $v(s,y)$:

$$u(t,x) = e^{\Theta R}v(s,y), \quad \frac{ds}{dt} = \frac{1}{\lambda^2}, \quad y = \frac{x}{\lambda} \tag{1.13}$$

determined up to the unknown modulation variables $(\lambda(t),\Theta(t))\in\mathbb{R}_+^*\times\mathbb{R}$. This maps (1.1) into the corresponding equation for v:

$$\partial_s v + \Theta_s R v - \frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}\Lambda v = v\wedge\Delta v, \quad (s,y)\in\mathbb{R}_+\times\mathbb{R}^2. \tag{1.14}$$

In order to understand the renormalized equation (1.14) in the vicinity of the harmonic map Q, we need to chose a gauge to describe v. A suitable gauge is provided by the Frenet basis associated to Q:

$$e_r = \frac{\partial_y Q}{|\partial_y Q|}, \quad e_\tau = \frac{\partial_\tau Q}{|\partial_\tau Q|}, \quad Q(y,\theta) = e^{R\theta}\left|\begin{array}{l}\Lambda\phi\\ 0\\ Z\end{array}\right.$$

where we introduced the explicit functions describing the ground state:

$$\phi(y) = 2\tan^{-1}(y), \quad \Lambda\phi = y\partial_y\phi = \frac{2y}{1+y^2}, \quad Z(y) = \frac{1-y^2}{1+y^2}. \tag{1.15}$$

At each point (y,θ) the triple (e_r, e_τ, Q) ia an orthonormal basis in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with (e_r,e_τ) spanning $T_{Q(y)}\mathbb{S}^2$. The equivariant symmetry assumption is equivalent to the statement that the expansion of v relative to the Frenet basis is given by the *spherically symmetric* coordinate functions:

$$v(s,y)=\hat{\alpha}(s,y)e_r+\hat{\beta}(s,y)e_\tau+(1+\hat{\gamma}(s,y))Q, \quad \hat{\alpha}^2+\hat{\beta}^2+(1+\hat{\gamma})^2=1.$$

step 2 A slowly modulated approximate solution.

We now construct a slowly modulated ansatz for the equation (1.14). This procedure is similar in spirit to the constructions in [29], [24], [26], [18], [35]. More precisely, we impose the modulation equations

$$-\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}=b, \quad -\Theta_s=a \tag{1.16}$$

and look for an approximate solution of the form

$$v(s,y)=v_{a(s),b(s)}(y)$$

for the unknown maps:

$$(a,b)\mapsto v_{a,b}(y), \quad s\mapsto (a(s),b(s)).$$

After linearization near Q, the equation (1.14) takes the form of a nonlinear (in fact, quasilinear) Schrödinger system driven by the (a,b) parameters:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l}\partial_s\hat{\alpha}-H\hat{\beta}=-b\Lambda\phi-b\Lambda\hat{\alpha}-a\hat{\beta}Z+N_1(\hat{\alpha},\hat{\beta})\\ \partial_s\hat{\beta}+H\hat{\alpha}=a\Lambda\phi-b\Lambda\hat{\beta}+a\hat{\alpha}Z++N_2(\hat{\alpha},\hat{\beta})\end{array}\right. \tag{1.17}$$

where H is the linearized Hamiltonian

$$H=-\Delta+\frac{V(y)}{y^2}, \quad V(y)=\frac{y^4-6y^2+1}{(1+y^2)^2}.$$

The general strategy is then to build an approximate solution via an asymptotic expansion relative to the small parameters (a,b):

$$\hat{\alpha}=aT_{1,0}(y)+b^2T_{0,2}(y)+a^2T_{2,0}(y), \quad \hat{\beta}=bT_{0,1}(y)+abT_{1,1}+\mathrm{lot} \tag{1.18}$$

and to chose the law for the parameters

$$a_s=-c_{1,1}ab+\ldots, \quad b_s=-c_{0,2}b^2-c_{2,0}a^2+\ldots... \tag{1.19}$$

which yields solutions $T_{i,j}$ of the generated elliptic equations

$$HT_{i,j}=N_{i,j}(\Lambda\phi,(T_{k,l})_{0\leq k<i,0\leq l<j})$$

with *least possible growth* in y. A general non trivial growth of solutions to the inhomogeneous problem $Hu=f$ is induced by a *resonance* $\Lambda\phi$ for the Schrödinger operator H:

$$H(\Lambda\phi)=0,$$

generated by the symmetry group (1.3). At the order b^1 the expansion (1.18) gives the equation

$$HT_{1,0}=HT_{0,1}=\Lambda\phi$$

which admits an explicit solution $T_{0,1}=T_{1,0}=T_1$ with growth at infinity:

$$T_1(y)=-y\mathrm{log}y+-y+O(1), \quad \Lambda T_1=-y\mathrm{log}y+O(1) \ \text{ as } \ y\to+\infty. \tag{1.20}$$

Examining the b^2 order terms in the second equation of (1.17) we obtain

$$HT_{0,2}=-\Lambda T_1+c_{0,2}T_1+N(\Lambda\phi,T_1).$$

The $y\log y$ growth of ΛT_1 can be compensated in (1.20) by the similar growth of T_1 and the choice of

$$c_{0,2} = 1.$$

Furthermore, similar to the construction for the wave map problem in [33], an additional explicit correction can be introduced to eliminate the remaining y growth in (1.20). This correction leads to a non trivial *flux computation* in the parabolic region $y \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{b}}$ and gives a leading order ODE for the parameter b:

$$b_s = -b^2\left(1 + \frac{2}{|\log b|}\right) + \text{lot}.$$

Similarily, the ab order term in the first equation of (1.17) leads to

$$HT_{1,1} = -(\Lambda T_1 - T_1) + c_{1,1}T_1 + N(\Lambda\phi, T_1)$$

where we used from (1.15):

$$Z(y) = -1 + O\left(\frac{1}{y^2}\right) \quad \text{as} \quad y \to +\infty.$$

This choice $c_{1,1} = 0$ ensures that $T_{1,1}$ has the least growth as $y \to \infty$. After an additional correction coupled with the flux computation we obtain the leading order ODE for a:

$$a_s = -2\frac{ab}{|\log b|} + \text{lot}.$$

The expansion (1.18), (1.19) results in the construction of *moderately* growing smooth profiles $T_{i,j}$ such that the ansatz (1.18) gives a high order approximate solution to the equation (1.14) *for the choice of the modulation parameters* driven by the system of ODE's (1.16)

$$\lambda_s = -b\lambda, \quad \Theta_s = -a$$

coupled with

$$b_s = -b^2\left(1 + \frac{2}{|\log b|}\right) - a^2 + O\left(\frac{b^2}{|\log b|^{1+\delta}}\right), \quad a_s = -\frac{2ab}{|\log b|} + O\left(\frac{b^2}{|\log b|^{1+\delta}}\right) \quad (1.21)$$

A spectacular feature of this system is that, generically in the regime of small a, b with positive initial value of b, the phase speed a dominates the concentration velocity b and, through the term $-a^2$, turns b negative, thus arresting the concentration behavior where $\lambda(s) \to 0$. Nonetheless, for a given initial $b_0 > 0$, one can find a locally unique $a_0(b_0)$ such that the corresponding solution of the a equation obeys the bound

$$|a| \ll \frac{b}{|\log b|^{1+\delta}}.$$

In this non-generic case, the remaining ODE's reduce to the system

$$-\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda} = b, \ \Theta_s = a, \quad b_s + b^2 = -\frac{2b^2}{|\log b|}.$$

Integrating and using the scaling (1.13) now easily leads to finite time blow up with the asymptotics (1.9).

step 3 Controlling radiation: the mixed energy/Morawetz Lyapunov functional.

Let $Q + \widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_{a,b}$ denote the approximate solution constructed in step 2. We now decompose the solution u relative to the Frenet basis:

$$u(t,x) = e^{\Theta(t)R}(Q + \widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_{a,b} + \mathbf{w})(s,y)$$

where the uniqueness of the decomposition is ensured through the choice of *four* suitable orthogonality conditions on $\mathbf{w}$, associated with the modulation parameters (λ, Θ, a, b). The rigorous derivation of the system of modulation equations (1.21) requires a careful control of the remainder radiation term $\mathbf{w}$ and relies on the estimate:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{|\mathbf{w}(s)|^2}{1+y^8} \lesssim \frac{b^4(s)}{|\mathrm{log} b(s)|^2}, \tag{1.22}$$

which in view of the expected behavior $b(s) \to 0$ as $s \to \infty$ has the appearance of a dispersive estimate for a solution of the Schrödinger equation. The y^8 weight is dictated by the slow decay of the ground state (1.15). From our choice of *four* orthogonality conditions and the explicit knowledge of the kernel of H, (1.22) is implied by the energy bound:

$$\mathcal{E}_4 = \|H^2 \mathbf{w}\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim \frac{b^4}{|\mathrm{log} b|^2}. \tag{1.23}$$

Following the strategy developed in [33], [35], we return to the original variables (t, r), in which

$$\mathbf{W}(t, r) := \mathbf{w}(s, y)$$

satisfies the equation:

$$i\partial_t \mathbf{W} + H_\lambda \mathbf{W} = \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \Psi(s, y) + \mathrm{lot},$$

where Ψ is the error in the construction of the approximate solution $\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_{a,b}$, and where

$$H_\lambda = -\Delta + \frac{V_\lambda}{r^2}, \quad V_\lambda(r) = V(y)$$

is the renormalized linearized operator with a potential V_λ. We compute the appropriately constructed energy identity providing control of the 4-th derivative of $\mathbf{W}$. Time dependence of the Hamiltonian H_λ leads to the appearance of quadratic terms which require the use of an additional Morawetz type identity. Here an important simplification of the analysis is provided by the *factorization* properties of H, see (2.11), which are a consequence of the Bogomol'nyi's factorization or, equivalently, certain *implicit* repulsive properties of H_λ. The result is a mixed energy/Morawetz Lyapunov control of the form

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left\{\frac{\mathcal{E}_4}{\lambda^6}\right\} \lesssim \frac{b}{\lambda^8} \frac{b^4}{|\mathrm{log} b|^2} \tag{1.24}$$

where the size of the RHS is dictated by the error in the construction of the approximate solution. Integration of (1.24) in the expected regime,

$$\lambda \sim \frac{b}{|\mathrm{log} b|^2},$$

yields the bound (1.23).

The strategy, as described, would present insurmountable difficulties due to the specific quasilinear structure of the Schrödinger map problem. Indeed, in the chosen gauge, the nonlinear terms in (1.17) contain expressions of the type

$$N_1(\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\beta}) \sim \hat{\alpha}\Delta\hat{\beta}, \hat{\beta}\Delta\hat{\alpha}, \ldots$$

which produce a *loss of two derivatives* in the computation of the energy identity. This is well a known problem, and the classical way to overcome this in the equivariant case is to use the generalized nonlinear Hasimoto transform, see [9], [15] which, in a suitable nonlinear frame, maps the equivariant flow to a nonlocal cubic nonlinear Schrödinger equation. We propose a simpler and more robust approach based on the computation of *suitably defined nonlinear Sobolev norms* equivalent to $\mathcal{E}_4$. The corresponding energy identities *do not loose derivatives.* At the level of the original problem for the Schrödinger map u, this can be traced to the observation that the quantity

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int |u\wedge\Delta\left(u\wedge\Delta u\right)|^2$$

can be controlled in a bootstrap not requiring any assumptions on the derivatives of u higher then the ones appearing in the quantity. The propagation of this property to the corresponding problem for the radiation $\mathbf{W}$ requires keeping careful track of the geometric structure of the system written in the Frenet basis, see (4.22) and Lemma 4.7.

This paper is organized as follows.

In section 2 we introduce the class of 1-equivariant solutions of the Schrödinger map problem, define the Frenet basis, renormalized variables and the linear Hamiltonian H. In section 3 we construct the approximate solution $\mathbf{w}_0=\mathbf{w}_{0(a,b)}$ and its localized version $\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0$. In section 4 we describe our bootstrap assumptions, set up the orthogonality conditions, define the nonlinear energies $\mathcal{E}_1$, $\mathcal{E}_2$, $\mathcal{E}_4$ for the remainder radiation term $\mathbf{w}$ and derive the modulation equations and the mixed energy/Morawetz type identity for $\mathcal{E}_4$. In section 5 we retrieve our bootstrap assumptions for the energies $\mathcal{E}_2$, $\mathcal{E}_4$ and the modulation parameters a, b. In section 6 we conclude the proof of the main result of the paper establishing a finite time blow up and the accompanying asymptotics. In Appendix A we examine coercivity properties of the operators H and H^2. In Appendix B we derive various interpolation bounds for the remainder $\mathbf{w}$ implied by the bounds on the energies $\mathcal{E}_1$, $\mathcal{E}_2$ and $\mathcal{E}_4$. These bounds are used extensively throughout the paper in the treatment of nonlinear terms.

Aknowledgements P.R is supported by the Junior ERC-ANR program SWAP. I.R. is partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-1001500. This work was completed while P.R. was visited the ETH, Zurich, which he would like to thank for its kind hospitality.

2. The 1-equivariant flow in the Frenet basis

This section is devoted to the description of the equivariant flow in the Frenet basis associated to the harmonic map Q. We recall in particular the main structure of the linearized operator, and give a vectorial formulation of the flow near Q expressed in coordinates, see (2.24), which will be important to handle the quasilinear structure of the problem.

2.1. Ground state and Frenet basis.

Let us provide the geometric and analytic setup for equivariantl solutions $u:\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^2\to\mathbb{S}^2\subset\mathbb{R}^3$ of the Schrödinger map flow:

$$\partial_t u = u\wedge\Delta u. \tag{2.1}$$

Maps with values in $\mathbb{S}^2$ will be treated as maps into $\mathbb{R}^3$ with the image parametrized by the Euler angles (ϕ,θ).

The ground state solution of (2.1)

$$Q=\left|\begin{array}{l}\sin(\phi(r))\cos\theta\\ \sin(\phi(r))\sin\theta\\ \cos(\phi(r))\end{array}\right. \quad \text{with} \quad \phi(r)=2\tan^{-1}(r) \tag{2.2}$$

is a harmonic map $\mathbb{R}^2\to\mathbb{S}^2$ of degree 1 and satisfies the equation

$$\Delta Q=-|\nabla Q|^2 Q.$$

Let us introduce the dilation operator

$$\Lambda=r\partial_r$$

and the functions:

$$\sin(\phi(r))=\Lambda\phi(r)=\frac{2r}{1+r^2},\quad \cos(\phi(r))=\frac{1-r^2}{1+r^2}=Z(r), \tag{2.3}$$

then

$$Q=\left|\begin{array}{l}\frac{2r}{1+r^2}\cos\theta\\ \frac{2r}{1+r^2}\sin\theta\\ \frac{1-r^2}{1+r^2}\end{array}\right. =e^{\theta R}\left|\begin{array}{l}\Lambda\phi\\ 0\\ Z\end{array}\right.$$

with the rotation generator R given in (1.4). Define

$$h=\frac{\sqrt{2}}{|\nabla Q|}=\frac{1+r^2}{2}=\frac{1}{1+Z}$$

and consider the normalized Frenet basis associated to Q:

$$e_r=\frac{\partial_r Q}{|\partial_r Q|}=h\partial_r Q=\left|\begin{array}{l}\frac{1-r^2}{1+r^2}\cos\theta\\ \frac{1-r^2}{1+r^2}\sin\theta\\ \frac{-2r}{1+r^2}\end{array}\right. ,\quad e_\tau=\frac{\partial_\tau Q}{|\nabla_\tau Q|}=h\partial_\tau Q=\left|\begin{array}{l}-\sin\theta\\ \cos\theta\\ 0\end{array}\right. . \tag{2.4}$$

We compute the action of derivatives and rotations in the moving frame of Q:

Lemma 2.1 (Derivation and rotation in the Frenet basis)**.** *There holds:*
(i) Action of derivatives*:*

$$\partial_r e_r=-(1+Z)Q,\quad \Lambda e_r=-\Lambda\phi Q,\quad \partial_\tau e_r=\frac{Z}{r}e_\tau,\quad \Delta e_r=-\frac{1}{r^2}e_r-\frac{2Z(1+Z)}{r}Q,$$

$$\partial_r e_\tau=0,\quad \Lambda e_\tau=0,\quad \partial_\tau e_\tau=-\frac{Z}{r}e_r-(1+Z)Q,\quad \Delta e_\tau=-\frac{1}{r^2}e_\tau,$$

$$\partial_r Q=(1+Z)e_r,\quad \Lambda Q=\Lambda\phi e_r,\quad \partial_\tau Q=(1+Z)e_\tau,\quad \Delta Q=-2(1+Z)^2Q.$$

(ii) Action of the R rotation*:*

$$Re_r=Ze_\tau,\quad Re_\tau=-Ze_r-\Lambda\phi Q,\quad RQ=\Lambda\phi e_\tau. \tag{2.5}$$

Note from the relation

$$e^{\Theta R}(u\wedge v)=\left(e^{\Theta R}u\right)\wedge\left(e^{\Theta R}v\right),\quad \forall\Theta\in\mathbb{R}, \tag{2.6}$$

that the scaling and rotation symmetries yield the two parameters family of harmonic maps

$$Q_{\Theta,\lambda}(r)=e^{\Theta R}Q(\frac{r}{\lambda}),\quad (\Theta,\lambda)\in\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}_+^*,$$

with the infinitesimal generators:

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda}(Q_{\Theta,\lambda})_{|\lambda=1,\Theta=0}=-\Lambda Q=-\Lambda\phi e_r, \tag{2.7}$$

$$\frac{d}{d\Theta}(Q_{\Theta,\lambda})_{|\lambda=1,\Theta=0}=RQ=\Lambda\phi e_\tau. \tag{2.8}$$

2.2. **Decomposition of equivariant maps in the Frenet basis.** A degree (index) 1 equivariant solution $u(t,r,\theta)$ of the Schrödinger map problem (2.1) is defined to have the form

$$u(t,r,\theta)=e^{\theta R}\left|\begin{array}{l}v_1(t,r)\\ v_2(t,r)\\ v_3(t,r)\end{array}\right. \quad \text{with} \ \ (v_1,v_2,v_3)=v\in\mathbb{S}^2.$$

The 1-equivariant symmetry is preserved by the Schrödinger map flow. Any equivariant map has uniquely defined radially symmetric coordinates in the Frenet basis. Indeed, let

$$u(t,r,\theta)=e^{\theta R}v(t,r)$$

be an equivariant map and define a decomposition of u relative to the Frenet basis (2.4):

$$u=\alpha(t,r)e_r+\beta(t,r)e_\tau+\gamma(t,r)Q=e^{\theta R}\left|\begin{array}{l}\alpha Z+\gamma\Lambda\phi\\ \beta\\ -\alpha\Lambda\phi+\gamma Z\end{array}\right. .$$

This leads to the relation

$$\begin{pmatrix} Z & 0 & \Lambda\phi\\ 0 & 1 & 0\\ -\Lambda\phi & 0 & Z\end{pmatrix}\left|\begin{array}{l}\alpha\\ \beta\\ \gamma\end{array}\right. = \left|\begin{array}{l}v_1\\ v_2\\ v_3\end{array}\right. ,$$

which uniquely determines $(\alpha,\beta,\gamma):\alpha^2+\beta^2+\gamma^2=1$ from (v_1,v_2,v_3).

2.3. **Linear Hamiltonian H and its factorization.** Recall the definition

$$Z(y)=\frac{1-y^2}{1+y^2}.$$

The function Z can be regarded as a solution of the equation

$$\Lambda Z=Z^2-1. \tag{2.9}$$

We introduce the following Schrödinger operator H which will appear as the leading order term in the linearization of the Schrödinger map equation, written relative to the Frenet basis, around Q:

$$H=-\Delta+\frac{V}{y^2}, \qquad y\in[0,\infty), \tag{2.10}$$

with the potential

$$V(y)=Z^2+\Lambda Z=2\Lambda Z+1=\frac{y^4-6y^2+1}{(1+y^2)^2}.$$

The Hamiltonian H admits the factorization

$$H=A^*A, \quad A=-\partial_y+\frac{Z}{y}, \quad A^*=\partial_y+\frac{1+Z}{y}, \tag{2.11}$$

where the conjugation is defined with respect to the 2-dimensional measure ydy. The conjuguate operator is given explicitely by:

$$\tilde{H}=AA^*=-\Delta+\frac{2(1+Z)}{y^2}=-\Delta+\frac{4}{y^2(1+y^2)}. \tag{2.12}$$

2.4. **Schrödinger map flow in the renormalized Frenet basis.** We introduce two time-dependent modulation parameters $\Theta(t)$ and $\lambda(t)$ responsible for the changes of the phase and scale, respectively, and the associated transformation $\mathcal{S}$:

$$(\mathcal{S}v)(t,r) = e^{\Theta(t)R}v(t,\frac{r}{\lambda}).$$

We define a space-time scaling transformation

$$\frac{ds}{dt} = \frac{1}{\lambda^2(t)}, \quad y = \frac{r}{\lambda(t)}$$

relative to which

$$v_\lambda(t,r) := v(t,\frac{r}{\lambda}) = v(s,y).$$

We compute

$$\partial_t v = \frac{\mathcal{S}}{\lambda^2}\left[\partial_s v + \Theta_s R v - \frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}\Lambda v\right]$$

and thus in particular:

$$\partial_t(\mathcal{S}e_r) = \frac{\mathcal{S}}{\lambda^2}\left\{\Theta_s Z e_\tau + \frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}\Lambda\phi Q\right\}, \tag{2.13}$$

$$\partial_t(\mathcal{S}e_\tau) = \frac{\mathcal{S}}{\lambda^2}\left\{\Theta_s(-Ze_r - \Lambda\phi Q)\right\} \tag{2.14}$$

$$\partial_t(\mathcal{S}Q) = \frac{\mathcal{S}}{\lambda^2}\left\{\Theta_s\Lambda\phi e_\tau - \frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}\Lambda\phi e_r\right\}. \tag{2.15}$$

Let u now be an equivariant Schrödinger map. We decompose u according to

$$u = \mathcal{S}(Q+v) \tag{2.16}$$

and expand $\mathcal{S}v$ relative to the Frenet basis associated with $\mathcal{S}Q$:

$$\mathcal{S}v = \hat\alpha_\lambda\mathcal{S}e_r + \hat\beta_\lambda\mathcal{S}e_\tau + \hat\gamma_\lambda\mathcal{S}Q.$$

The coefficients

$$(\hat\alpha(t,r),\hat\beta(t,r),\hat\gamma(t,r)) = (\hat\alpha(s,y),\hat\beta(s,y),\hat\gamma(s,y))$$

obey the constraint

$$\hat\alpha^2 + \hat\beta^2 + (1+\hat\gamma)^2 = 1. \tag{2.17}$$

The map $\mathcal{S}v$ satisfies the equation

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t(\mathcal{S}v) &= \mathcal{S}Q\wedge\Delta(\mathcal{S}v) + \mathcal{S}v\wedge\Delta(\mathcal{S}Q) - \partial_t(\mathcal{S}Q) + \mathcal{S}v\wedge\Delta(\mathcal{S}v) \qquad (2.18)\\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda^2}\mathcal{S}\left\{Q\wedge(\Delta v + |\nabla Q|^2 v) + v\wedge\Delta v + \frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}\Lambda\phi e_r - \Theta_s\Lambda\phi e_\tau\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

We now re-express quantities involving $\mathcal{S}v$ in terms of the coefficients $(\hat\alpha_\lambda,\hat\beta_\lambda,\hat\gamma_\lambda)$:

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t(\mathcal{S}v) &= \left\{\partial_t\hat\alpha_\lambda - \frac{\hat\beta_\lambda}{\lambda^2}(\Theta_s Z)_\lambda + \frac{\hat\gamma_\lambda}{\lambda^2}\left(-\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}\Lambda\phi\right)_\lambda\right\}\mathcal{S}e_r\\ &+ \left\{\partial_t\hat\beta_\lambda + \frac{\hat\alpha_\lambda}{\lambda^2}(\Theta_s Z)_\lambda + \frac{\hat\gamma_\lambda}{\lambda^2}(\Theta_s\Lambda\phi)_\lambda\right\}\mathcal{S}e_\tau\\ &+ \left\{\partial_t\hat\gamma_\lambda + \frac{\hat\alpha}{\lambda^2}\left(\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}\Lambda\phi\right)_\lambda - \frac{\hat\beta}{\lambda^2}(\Theta_s\Lambda\phi)_\lambda\right\}\mathcal{S}Q.\end{aligned}$$

We now use the algebra:

$$\frac{1}{y^2} - 2(1+Z)^2 = \frac{y^4 - 6y^2 + 1}{y^2(1+y^2)^2} = \frac{V(y)}{y^2}$$

to compute:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta v+|\nabla Q|^2 v &= \left(-H\hat{\alpha}+2(1+Z)\partial_y\hat{\gamma}\right)e_r+(-H\hat{\beta})e_\tau \\ &+ \left(-\frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}\hat{\alpha}+\Delta\hat{\gamma}-2(1+Z)\partial_y\hat{\alpha}\right)Q\end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

where H is the Hamiltonian (2.10). This gives for the linear term in v:

$$Q\wedge\left(\Delta v+|\nabla Q|^2 v\right)=(H\hat{\beta})e_r+\left(-H\hat{\alpha}+2(1+Z)\partial_y\hat{\gamma}\right)e_\tau.$$

The nonlinear term produces the expression:

$$\begin{aligned}&v\wedge\Delta v=v\wedge\left(\Delta v+|\nabla Q|^2 v\right)\\ =\;&\left[-\frac{2Z(1+Z)}{r}\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}+\beta(\Delta\hat{\gamma}-2(1+Z)\partial_y\hat{\alpha})+\hat{\gamma}H\hat{\beta}\right]e_r\\ +\;&\left[\frac{2Z(1+Z)}{r}\hat{\alpha}^2-\hat{\alpha}(\Delta\hat{\gamma}-2(1+Z)\partial_y\hat{\alpha})+\hat{\gamma}(-H\hat{\alpha}+2(1+Z)\partial_y\hat{\gamma})\right]e_\tau\\ +\;&\left[-\hat{\alpha}H\hat{\beta}+\hat{\beta}(H\hat{\alpha}-2(1+Z)\partial_r\hat{\gamma})\right]Q.\end{aligned}$$

We now project (2.18) onto $\mathrm{Span}\{\mathcal{S}e_r,\mathcal{S}e_\tau\}$ and obtain the equivalent set of renormalized equations:

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_s\hat{\alpha}-\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}\Lambda\hat{\alpha}&=H\hat{\beta}-\frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}+\hat{\beta}(\Delta\hat{\gamma}-2(1+Z)\partial_y\hat{\alpha})+\hat{\gamma}H\hat{\beta}\\ &+\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}(1+\hat{\gamma})\Lambda\phi+\Theta_s\hat{\beta}Z,\end{aligned}\tag{2.20}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_s\hat{\beta}-\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}\Lambda\hat{\beta}&=-H\hat{\alpha}+\frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}\hat{\alpha}^2+2(1+Z)\partial_y\hat{\gamma}-\hat{\alpha}(\Delta\hat{\gamma}-2(1+Z)\partial_y\hat{\alpha})\\ &+\hat{\gamma}(-H\hat{\alpha}+2(1+Z)\partial_y\hat{\gamma})-\Theta_s(1+\hat{\gamma})(\Lambda\phi)-\Theta_s\hat{\alpha}Z\end{aligned}\tag{2.21}$$

$$\partial_s\hat{\gamma}-\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}\Lambda\hat{\gamma}=-\hat{\alpha}H\hat{\beta}+\hat{\beta}(H\hat{\alpha}-2(1+Z)\partial_r\hat{\gamma})-\hat{\alpha}\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}\Lambda\phi+\hat{\beta}\Theta_s\Lambda\phi.\tag{2.22}$$

2.5. **Vectorial formulation.** An essential feature of our analysis is to keep track of the geometric structure of (1.1). On the other hand, an examination of the equations (2.20), (2.21) and (2.22), associated with the Frenet basis of $\mathcal{S}Q$, reveals the structure of a quasilinear Schrödinger system. To overcome a potential loss of derivatives in the analysis of the system, we rewrite the linear system in a vectorial form. Let $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}$ be the vector of coordinates in the Frenet basis:

$$\widehat{\mathbf{w}}=\left|\begin{array}{c}\hat{\alpha}\\ \hat{\beta}\\ \hat{\gamma}\end{array}\right.\tag{2.23}$$

and e_z denote

$$e_z=\left|\begin{array}{c}0\\ 0\\ 1\end{array}\right. .$$

The system of equations for $\hat{\alpha},\hat{\beta},\hat{\gamma}$ can be then equivalently expressed in the form

$$\partial_s\widehat{\mathbf{w}}-\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}\Lambda\widehat{\mathbf{w}}+\Theta_s ZR\widehat{\mathbf{w}}=-\widehat{J}\left[\mathbb{H}\widehat{\mathbf{w}}+\Lambda\phi\left|\begin{array}{c}\Theta_s\\ \frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}\\ 0\end{array}\right.\right]\tag{2.24}$$

with

$$\widehat{J}=(e_z+\widehat{\mathbf{w}})\wedge,\quad |e_z+\widehat{\mathbf{w}}|^2=1,\tag{2.25}$$

$$\mathbb{H}\widehat{\mathbf{w}} = \left|\begin{array}{l} H\hat{\alpha} \\ H\hat{\beta} \\ -\Delta\hat{\gamma} \end{array}\right. + 2(1+Z)\left|\begin{array}{l} -\partial_y\hat{\gamma} \\ 0 \\ \partial_y\hat{\alpha}+\frac{Z}{y}\hat{\alpha} \end{array}\right. . \tag{2.26}$$

A direct computation shows that the vectorial Hamiltonian $\mathbb{H}$ is (formally) self-adjoint:

$$\mathbb{H} = \mathbb{H}^*.$$

We also define the vectorial operators $\mathbb{A}$ and $\mathbb{A}^*$:

$$\mathbb{A}\widehat{\mathbf{w}} = \left|\begin{array}{l} A\hat{\alpha} \\ A\hat{\beta} \\ 0 \end{array}\right. , \tag{2.27}$$

$$\mathbb{A}^*\widehat{\mathbf{w}} = \left|\begin{array}{l} A^*\hat{\alpha} \\ A^*\hat{\beta} \\ 0 \end{array}\right. \tag{2.28}$$

3. Construction of the approximate profile

The aim of this section is to construct an approximate solution with a *controllable growth* in y variable to the modulated nonlinear equation (2.24). This construction depends on an assumed dynamics of the modulation parameters $(\Theta(s), \lambda(s))$. In turn, the above dynamics depends on the interaction between the approximate profile, with the first term given by $\mathcal{S}Q$, and the remaining radiation part of the solution. We complement (Θ, λ) by two additional modulation parameters a and b and assume that to a leading order:

$$-\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda} = b, \quad -\Theta_s = a, \quad b_s = -(b^2+a^2), \quad a_s = 0. \tag{3.1}$$

This choice will be justified in our final analysis.

Proposition 3.1 (Construction of the approximate profile)**.** *Let $M > 0$ be a large universal constant, then there exists a small enough universal constant $b^* = b^*(M) > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $0 < b < b^*$, $|a| \leq \frac{b}{|\log b|}$ and B_0, B_1 be given by* (1.12)*, then there exist profiles $T_{i,j}$ such that*

$$\mathbf{w}_0 = \left|\begin{array}{l} \alpha_0 \\ \beta_0 \\ \gamma_0 \end{array}\right. \tag{3.2}$$

with

$$\alpha_0 = aT_{1,0} + b^2T_{0,2} + a^2T_{2,0}, \quad \beta_0 = bT_{0,1} + abT_{1,1} + b^3T_{0,3}, \tag{3.3}$$

$$\gamma_0 = b^2S_{0,2} \quad \textit{with} \quad S_{0,2} = -\frac{1}{2}T_{0,1}^2 \tag{3.4}$$

is an approximate solution of (2.24) *(in the regime* (3.1)*) in the sense that the error*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{\Psi}_0 \quad &= \quad \left|\begin{array}{l} \Psi_0^{(1)} \\ \Psi_0^{(2)} \\ \Psi_0^{(3)} \end{array}\right. = -b\Lambda\mathbf{w}_0 + ZR\mathbf{w}_0 - (e_z+\mathbf{w}_0)\wedge\left[\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}_0 - \Lambda\phi\left|\begin{array}{l} a \\ b \\ 0 \end{array}\right.\right] \\ &+ \quad \left|\begin{array}{l} 2b(b^2+a^2)T_{0,2} \\ (b^2+a^2)T_{0,1} + a(b^2+a^2)T_{1,1} \\ 2b(b^2+a^2)S_{0,2} \end{array}\right. \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

satisfies the bounds:
(i) Weighted norm estimates:

$$\int_{y\leq 2B_1}\frac{|\partial_y^i\Psi_0^{(1)}|^2}{y^{6-2i}}+\int_{y\leq 2B_1}\frac{|\partial_y^i\Psi_0^{(2)}|^2}{y^{6-2i}}\lesssim\frac{b^4}{|\mathrm{log}b|^2},\quad 0\leq i\leq 3, \tag{3.6}$$

$$\int_{y\leq 2B_1}\frac{|\partial_y^i\Psi_0^{(3)}|^2}{y^{8-2i}}\lesssim\frac{b^6}{|\mathrm{log}b|^2},\quad 0\leq i\leq 4, \tag{3.7}$$

(i') Localized estimates:

$$\int_{B_1\leq y\leq 2B_1}|\partial_y^i\Psi_0^{(1)}|^2+\int_{B_1\leq y\leq 2B_1}|\partial_y^i\Psi_0^{(2)}|^2\lesssim\frac{b^4}{|\mathrm{log}b|^2}(bB_1^{4-i})^2,\quad 0\leq i\leq 4, \tag{3.8}$$

$$\int_{B_1\leq y\leq 2B_1}|\partial_y^i\Psi_0^{(3)}|^2\lesssim\frac{b^4}{|\mathrm{log}b|^2}(bB_1^{3-i}\mathrm{log}^2B_1)^2,\quad 0\leq i\leq 4. \tag{3.9}$$

(ii) H^2, H^3 estimates:

$$\int_{y\leq 2B_1}|H\Psi_0^{(1)}|^2+|H\Psi_0^{(2)}|^2\lesssim b^4|\mathrm{log}b|^2, \tag{3.10}$$

$$\int_{y\leq 2B_1}\frac{|\partial_y^iH\Psi_0^{(1)}|^2}{y^{2-2i}}+\int_{y\leq 2B_1}\frac{|\partial_y^iH\Psi_0^{(2)}|^2}{y^{2-2i}}\lesssim\frac{b^4}{|\mathrm{log}b|^2},\quad 0\leq i\leq 1. \tag{3.11}$$

(iii) Sharp H^4 estimate:

$$\int_{y\leq 2B_1}|H^2\Psi_0^{(i)}|^2\lesssim\frac{b^6}{|\mathrm{log}b|^2},\quad i=1,2. \tag{3.12}$$

(iv) Flux computation*: Let Φ_M be given by*

$$\Phi_M=\chi_M\Lambda\phi-c_MH(\chi_M\Lambda\phi)$$

with

$$c_M=\frac{(\chi_M\Lambda\phi,T_{1,0})}{(H(\chi_M\Lambda\phi),T_{1,0})}=c_\chi\frac{M^2}{4}(1+o_{M\to+\infty}(1)),$$

see (4.1)*, then:*

$$\frac{(H(\Psi_0^{(2)}),\Phi_M)}{(\Lambda\phi,\Phi_M)}=-\frac{2b^2}{|\mathrm{log}b|}+O\left(\frac{b^2}{|\mathrm{log}b|^2}\right), \tag{3.13}$$

$$\frac{(H(\Psi_0^{(1)}),\Phi_M)}{(\Lambda\phi,\Phi_M)}=-\frac{2ab}{|\mathrm{log}b|}+O\left(\frac{b^2}{|\mathrm{log}b|^2}\right). \tag{3.14}$$

Remark 3.2. *The flux computations* (3.13), (3.14) *will be central in the derivation of the correction to the approximate system of modulation equations* (3.1)*. The improved behavior, relative to the powers of* b*, in* (3.7), (3.12) *will be fundamental for the H^4 bounds on the remaining radiative part of the solution.*

Remark 3.3. *We also record the important behavior of the constructed profiles $T_{i,j}$ for small and large values of y: for $y\leq 1$,*

$$T_{0,1}=T_{1,0}=O(y^3),\quad T_{0,2}=T_{2,0}=T_{0,3}=O(y^5),$$

and for $y\geq 1$:

$$T_{0,1}=T_{1,0}=O(y\mathrm{log}y),\quad T_{0,2}=O\left(\frac{y}{b|\mathrm{log}b|}\right),\quad T_{2,0}=O(y|\mathrm{log}y|^3), \tag{3.15}$$

$$T_{0,3}=O\left(\frac{y^3}{b|\mathrm{log}b|}\right). \tag{3.16}$$

The above relations also hold for the derivatives with the usual convention that each derivative reduces one power of y.

Proof of Proposition 3.1

We compute the coordinate components of the error $\mathbf{\Psi}_0$ from (3.3), (3.4), (3.5), and obtain after collecting the terms with the like powers of a, b:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Psi_0^{(1)} = b\left\{HT_{0,1} - \Lambda\phi\right\} \\
+ \quad & b^3\left\{HT_{0,3} - \frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{0,2}T_{0,1} + T_{0,1}\Delta S_{0,2} - 2(1+Z)T_{0,1}\partial_y T_{0,2} + S_{0,2}HT_{0,1}\right. \\
- \quad & \left.\Lambda T_{0,2} - S_{0,2}\Lambda\phi + 2T_{0,2}\right\} \\
+ \quad & ab\left\{HT_{1,1} - \frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{1,0}T_{0,1} - 2(1+Z)T_{0,1}\partial_y T_{0,1} - \Lambda T_{0,1} - ZT_{0,1}\right\} \\
+ \quad & ab^3\left\{T_{1,1}\Delta S_{0,2} - 2(1+Z)T_{1,1}\partial_y T_{0,2} - ZT_{0,3} - 2(1+Z)T_{0,3}\partial_y T_{1,0} + S_{0,2}HT_{1,1}\right. \\
- \quad & \left.\frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}(T_{1,0}T_{0,3} + T_{0,2}T_{1,1})\right\} \\
+ \quad & a^2b\left\{-\frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{1,0}T_{1,1} - 2(1+Z)T_{1,1}\partial_y T_{1,0} - ZT_{1,1}\right. \\
- \quad & \left.\Lambda T_{2,0} - \frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{2,0}T_{0,1} - 2(1+Z)T_{0,1}\partial_y T_{2,0} + 2T_{0,2}\right\} \\
+ \quad & a^3b\left\{-\frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{2,0}T_{1,1} - 2(1+Z)T_{1,1}\partial_y T_{2,0}\right\} \\
+ \quad & b^5\left\{-\frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{0,2}T_{0,3} + T_{0,3}(\Delta S_{0,2} - 2(1+Z)\partial_y T_{0,2}) + S_{0,2}HT_{0,3}\right\} \\
+ \quad & a^2b^3\left\{-\frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{2,0}T_{3,0} - 2(1+Z)T_{0,3}\partial_y T_{2,0}\right\}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Psi_0^{(2)} = a\left\{-HT_{1,0} + \Lambda\phi\right\} \\
+ \quad & b^2\left\{-HT_{0,2} + 2(1+Z)\partial_y S_{0,2} - \Lambda T_{0,1} + T_{0,1}\right\} \\
+ \quad & b^4\left\{-T_{0,2}\Delta S_{0,2} + \frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{0,2}^2 + 2(1+Z)T_{0,2}\partial_y T_{0,2} - S_{0,2}HT_{0,2}\right. \\
+ \quad & \left.2(1+Z)S_{0,2}\partial_y S_{0,2} - \Lambda T_{0,3}\right\} \\
+ \quad & a^2\left\{-HT_{2,0} + \frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{1,0}^2 + 2(1+Z)T_{1,0}\partial_y T_{1,0} + ZT_{1,0} + T_{0,1}\right\} \\
+ \quad & ab^2\left\{\frac{4Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{1,0}T_{0,2} - T_{1,0}\Delta S_{0,2} + 2(1+Z)(T_{1,0}\partial_y T_{0,2} + T_{0,2}\partial_y T_{1,0} + T_{1,1})\right. \\
- \quad & \left.S_{0,2}HT_{1,0} - \Lambda T_{1,1} + ZT_{0,2} + S_{0,2}\Lambda\phi\right\} \\
+ \quad & a^3\left\{\frac{4Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{2,0}T_{1,0} + 2(1+Z)(\partial_y T_{2,0}T_{1,0} + T_{2,0}\partial_y T_{1,0}) + ZT_{2,0} + T_{1,1}\right\} \\
+ \quad & a^2b^2\left\{-S_{0,2}HT_{2,0} + \frac{4Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{0,2}T_{2,0} - T_{2,0}\Delta S_{0,2} + 2(1+Z)(\partial_y T_{0,2}T_{2,0} + T_{0,2}\partial_y T_{2,0})\right\} \\
+ \quad & a^4\left\{\frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{2,0}^2 + 2(1+Z)T_{2,0}\partial_y T_{2,0}\right\},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_0^{(3)} &= ab\,\{-T_{1,0}(HT_{0,1}-\Lambda\phi)+T_{0,1}(HT_{1,0}-\Lambda\phi)\} && (3.19)\\ + & \; b^3\,\{-T_{0,2}(HT_{0,1}-\Lambda\phi)+T_{0,1}HT_{0,2}-2(1+Z)T_{0,1}\partial_y S_{0,2}-\Lambda S_{0,2}+2S_{0,2}\}\\ + & \; a^2b\,\{-T_{1,0}HT_{1,1}+T_{1,1}(HT_{1,0}-\Lambda\phi)-T_{2,0}HT_{0,1}+T_{0,1}HT_{2,0}+2S_{0,2}\}\\ + & \; ab^3\,\{-T_{1,0}HT_{0,3}+T_{0,3}(HT_{1,0}-\Lambda\phi)-2(1+Z)T_{1,1}\partial_y S_{0,2}\}\\ + & \; a^3b\,\{-T_{2,0}HT_{1,1}+T_{1,1}HT_{2,0}\}\\ + & \; b^5\,\{-T_{0,2}HT_{0,3}+T_{0,3}HT_{0,2}-2(1+Z)T_{0,3}\partial_y S_{0,2}\}\\ + & \; a^2b^3\,\{-T_{2,0}HT_{0,3}+T_{0,3}HT_{2,0}\} && (3.20) \end{aligned}$$

Step 1 Construction of $T_{1,0}, T_{0,1}$.

We start by computing the Green's functions of the Hamiltonian H. We have $H(\Lambda\phi)=0$ and

$$H(\Gamma)=0 \;\; \text{for} \;\; y>0$$

with:

$$\Gamma(y)=\Lambda\phi\int_1^y \frac{dx}{x(\Lambda\phi(x))^2}=\frac{y}{2(1+y^2)}\int_1^y \frac{1+2x^2+x^4}{x^3}dx$$

which yields

$$\Gamma(y)=\left\{\begin{array}{l} O(\frac{1}{y}) \;\; \text{as} \;\; y\to 0,\\ \frac{y}{4}+O\left(\frac{\log y}{y}\right) \;\; \text{as} \;\; y\to+\infty. \end{array}\right. \tag{3.21}$$

The functions $\Lambda\phi$ and Γ allow us to find a regular solution f of an inhomogeneous equation

$$Hf=g$$

in the form

$$f(y)=\Lambda\phi(y)\int_0^y g(x)\Gamma(x)xdx-\Gamma(y)\int_0^y g(x)\Lambda\phi(x)xdx$$

modulo a multiple of the (regular) element of the kernel of H – the function $\Lambda\phi$. We let $T_{1,0}=T_{0,1}=T_1(y)$ be the solution to

$$HT_1=\Lambda\phi \tag{3.22}$$

given by:

$$\begin{aligned} T_1(y) &= \Lambda\phi(y)\int_0^y \Gamma(x)\Lambda\phi(x)xdx-\Gamma(y)\int_0^y(\Lambda\phi)^2xdx && (3.23)\\ &= -\frac{(1-y^4)\log(1+y^2)+2y^4-y^2-4y^2\int_0^y\frac{\log(1+s^2)}{s}ds}{2y(1+y^2)}. && (3.24) \end{aligned}$$

We easily see that for $y\to+\infty$

$$T_1(y)=-y\log y+y+O\left(\frac{(\log y)^2}{y}\right), \;\; \Lambda T_1(y)=-y\log y+O\left(\frac{(\log y)^2}{y}\right), \tag{3.25}$$

and at the origin

$$T_1(y)=\frac{1}{2}y^3+O(y^5). \tag{3.26}$$

Rescaling the equation for T_1 we also observe that

$$H(\Lambda T_1)=2\Lambda\phi+\Lambda^2\phi-\frac{\Lambda V}{y^2}T_1. \tag{3.27}$$

Step 2 Construction of the radiation Σ_b.

We define Σ_b to be the solution of the equation

$$H\Sigma_b = c_b\chi_{\frac{B_0}{4}}\Lambda\phi + d_bH\left[(1-\chi_{3B_0})\Lambda\phi)\right], \tag{3.28}$$

with

$$c_b = \frac{4}{\int\chi_{\frac{B_0}{4}}(\Lambda\phi(x))^2xdx}, \quad d_b = c_b\int_0^{B_0}\chi_{\frac{B_0}{4}}\Lambda\phi(x)\Gamma(x)xdx. \tag{3.29}$$

given by

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_b(y) &= -\Gamma(y)\int_0^y c_b\chi_{\frac{B_0}{4}}(\Lambda\phi(x))^2xdx + \Lambda\phi(y)\int_0^y c_b\chi_{\frac{B_0}{4}}\Lambda\phi(x)\Gamma(x)xdx\\ &- d_b(1-\chi_{3B_0})\Lambda\phi(y).\end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\Sigma_b = c_bT_1 \text{ for } y \le \frac{B_0}{8}, \tag{3.30}$$

$$\Sigma_b = -4\Gamma(y) = -y + O\left(\frac{\log y}{y}\right) \text{ for } y \ge 6B_0, \tag{3.31}$$

and from (3.28) and the definition of $B_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{b}}$:

$$c_b = \frac{2}{|\log b|}\left(1 + O(\frac{1}{|\log b|})\right), \quad d_b = O\left(\frac{1}{b|\log b|}\right). \tag{3.32}$$

We now estimate Σ_b using (3.21): for $6B_0 \le y \le 2B_1$,

$$\Sigma_b(y) = -y + O\left(\frac{\log y}{y}\right), \tag{3.33}$$

and for $y \le 6B_0$:

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_b(y) &= -c_b\left(\frac{y}{4} + O\left(\frac{\log y}{y}\right)\right)\left[\int_0^y\chi_{\frac{B_0}{4}}(\Lambda\phi(x))^2xdx\right] + c_b\Lambda\phi(y)\int_1^y O(x)dx\\ &+ O\left(\frac{1}{by|\log b|}\mathbf{1}_{B_0\le y\le 6B_0}\right)\\ &= -y\frac{\int_0^y\chi_{\frac{B_0}{4}}(\Lambda\phi(x))^2xdx}{\int\chi_{\frac{B_0}{4}}(\Lambda\phi(x))^2xdx} + O\left(\frac{1+y}{|\log b|}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{3.34}$$

Far out Σ_b is the leading order radiation term. It is large and dominant near B_0, but small, with a $\frac{1}{|\log b|}$ gain, on compact sets $y \le C$.

Step 3 Construction of $T_{0,2}$.

Define

$$\Sigma_{0,2} = 2(1+Z)\partial_yS_{0,2} - \Lambda T_{0,1} + T_{0,1} + \Sigma_b, \tag{3.35}$$

then from (3.23), (3.33), (3.34): for $y \ge 6B_0$,

$$\Sigma_{0,2}(y) = O\left(\frac{(\log y)^2}{y}\right), \tag{3.36}$$

and for $1 \le y \le 6B_0$:

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_{0,2}(y) &= -y\left(\frac{\int_0^y\chi_{\frac{B_0}{4}}(\Lambda\phi(x))^2xdx}{\int\chi_{\frac{B_0}{4}}(\Lambda\phi(x))^2xdx} - 1\right) + O\left(\frac{1+y}{|\log b|}\right) + O\left(\frac{(\log y)^2}{y}\right)\\ &= O\left(\frac{1+y}{|\log b|}(1 + |\log(y\sqrt{b})|)\right).\end{aligned} \tag{3.37}$$

Note that the improved behavior of $\Sigma_{0,2}(y)$ for large values of y in (3.36), (3.37) relies on the cancellation between the terms Σ_b, $\Lambda T_{0,1}$ and $T_{0,1}$ and thus depends on the introduction of the radiation Σ_b and the presence of the term b^2T_1 on the RHS of (3.18), which appeared there as a consequence of the approximate modulation dynamics equation $b_s = -b^2$ in (2.24). Higher order derivatives are estimated similarily. We now let $T_{0,2}$ be the solution to

$$HT_{0,2} = \Sigma_{0,2} \tag{3.38}$$

given by

$$T_{0,2}(y) = \Lambda\phi(y)\int_0^y \Sigma_{0,2}\Gamma(x)xdx - \Gamma(y)\int_0^y \Sigma_{0,2}(x)\Lambda\phi(x)xdx. \tag{3.39}$$

We derive from (3.36), (3.37) the bound:

$$\forall y \leq 2B_1, \quad |T_{0,2}(y)| \lesssim \frac{(1+y)}{b|\mathrm{log} b|}. \tag{3.40}$$

Note that we also have the crude bound:

$$\forall y \leq 2B_1, \quad |T_{0,2}(y)| \lesssim (1+y^3) \tag{3.41}$$

and the high order vanishing near the origin:

$$|T_{0,2}(y)| \lesssim y^5 \quad \text{for} \quad y \leq 1.$$

Again, rescaling the equation for $T_{0,2}$, observe that

$$H(\Lambda T_{0,2}) = 2\Sigma_{0,2} + \Lambda\Sigma_{0,2} - \frac{\Lambda V}{y^2}T_{0,2}. \tag{3.42}$$

Step 4 Construction of $T_{1,1}$.

Define

$$\Sigma_{1,1} = \frac{2Z(1+Z)}{r}T_1^2 + 2(1+Z)T_{0,1}\partial_y T_{0,1} + \Lambda T_{0,1} + ZT_{0,1} - \Sigma_b \tag{3.43}$$

then from (3.23), (3.33), (3.34): for $6B_0 \leq y \leq 2B_1$,

$$\Sigma_{1,1}(y) = O\left(\frac{(\mathrm{log} y)^2}{y}\right)$$

and for $1 \leq y \leq 6B_0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{1,1}(y) &= y\left(\frac{\int_0^y \chi_{\frac{B_0}{4}-1}(\Lambda\phi(x))^2xdx}{\int \chi_{\frac{B_0}{4}}(\Lambda\phi(x))^2xdx}\right) + O\left(\frac{1+y}{|\mathrm{log} b|}\right) + O\left(\frac{(\mathrm{log} y)^2}{y}\right) \\ &\lesssim \frac{1+y}{|\mathrm{log} b|}(1+|\log(y\sqrt{b})|). \end{aligned} \tag{3.44}$$

We now let $T_{1,1}$ be the solution to

$$HT_{1,1} = \Sigma_{1,1} \tag{3.45}$$

given by

$$T_{1,1}(y) = \Lambda\phi(y)\int_0^y \Sigma_{1,1}\Gamma(x)xdx - \Gamma(y)\int_0^y \Sigma_{1,1}(x)\Lambda\phi(x)xdx.$$

We derive from (3.44), (3.44) the bound: $\forall y \leq 2B_1$,

$$|T_{1,1}(y)| \lesssim \frac{1+y}{b|\mathrm{log} b|}, \tag{3.46}$$

the crude bound

$$|T_{1,1}(y)| \lesssim (1+y^3), \tag{3.47}$$

and the high order vanishing near the origin

$$|T_{1,1}(y)| \lesssim y^5 \ \text{ for } \ y \leq 1.$$

Observe, by construction and rescaling, that

$$HT_{1,1} = \Sigma_{1,1}, \quad H(\Lambda T_{1,1}) = 2\Sigma_{1,1} + \Lambda\Sigma_{1,1} - \frac{\Lambda V}{y^2}T_{1,1}. \tag{3.48}$$

step 5 Construction of $T_{2,0}$.

Define

$$\Sigma_{2,0} = \frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{1,0}^2 + 2(1+Z)T_{1,0}\partial_y T_{1,0} + (1+Z)T_{1,0} = O\left(\frac{|\text{log}y|^2}{1+y}\right)$$

and $T_{2,0}$ be the solution to

$$HT_{2,0} = \Sigma_{2,0}$$

given by

$$T_{2,0}(y) = \Lambda\phi(y)\int_0^y \Sigma_{2,0}\Gamma(x)xdx - \Gamma(y)\int_0^y \Sigma_{2,0}(x)\Lambda\phi(x)xdx,$$

then

$$|T_{2,0}(y)| \lesssim y^5 \ \text{ for } \ y \leq 1$$

and

$$|T_{2,0}(y)| \lesssim (1+y)|\text{log}y|^3.$$

Step 6 Construction of $T_{0,3}$.

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{0,3} &= 2\frac{Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{0,2}T_{0,1} - T_{0,1}\Delta S_{0,2} + 2(1+Z)T_{0,1}\partial_y T_{0,2} \\ &+ \Lambda T_{0,2} - 2T_{0,2}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.49}$$

We have from (3.40):

$$\forall y \leq 2B_1, \quad |\Sigma_{0,3}(y)| \lesssim \frac{1+y}{b|\text{log}b|}, \tag{3.50}$$

the crude bound:

$$\forall y \leq 2B_1, \quad |\Sigma_{0,3}(y)| \lesssim (1+y^3), \tag{3.51}$$

and the vanishing at the origin:

$$|\Sigma_{0,3}(y)| \lesssim y^5 \ \text{ for } \ y \leq 1.$$

We then let $T_{0,3}$ be the solution to

$$HT_{0,3} = \Sigma_{0,3} \tag{3.52}$$

given by

$$T_{0,3}(y) = \Lambda\phi(y)\int_0^y \Sigma_{0,3}\Gamma(x)xdx - \Gamma(y)\int_0^y \Sigma_{0,3}(x)\Lambda\phi(x)xdx$$

for which we obtain from (3.50):

$$\forall y \leq 2B_1, \quad |T_{0,3}(y)| \lesssim \frac{1+y^3}{b|\text{log}b|}, \tag{3.53}$$

with the crude bound from (3.51):

$$|T_{0,3}(y)| \lesssim (1+y^5). \tag{3.54}$$

Observe that for $y \leq 2B_1$

$$b|T_{0,2}|+b|T_{1,1}|+b|T_{2,0}|+b|S_{0,2}|+b^2|T_{0,3}| \lesssim \frac{y|\mathrm{log} y|^2}{\mathrm{log} b}$$

step 7 Estimate on $\mathbf{\Psi}_0$.

We compute from (3.17), (3.22), (3.38), (3.45), (3.52):

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi_0^{(1)} &= ab\left\{-\Sigma_b\right\} &(3.55)\\
&+ ab^3\big\{T_{1,1}\Delta S_{0,2}-2(1+Z)T_{1,1}\partial_y T_{0,2}-ZT_{0,3}-2(1+Z)T_{0,3}\partial_y T_{1,0}+S_{0,2}\Sigma_{1,1}\\
&- \frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}(T_{1,0}T_{0,3}+T_{0,2}T_{1,1})\big\}\\
&+ a^2b\left\{-\frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{1,0}T_{1,1}-2(1+Z)T_{1,1}\partial_y T_{1,0}-ZT_{1,1}-\Lambda T_{0,2}\right.\\
&- \left. 2\frac{Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{2,0}T_{0,1}-2(1+Z)T_{0,1}\partial_y T_{2,0}\right\}\\
&+ a^3b\left\{-\frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{2,0}T_{1,1}-2(1+Z)T_{1,1}\partial_y T_{2,0}\right\}\\
&+ b^5\left\{-\frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{0,2}T_{0,3}+T_{0,3}(\Delta S_{0,2}-2(1+Z)\partial_y T_{0,2})+S_{0,2}\Sigma_{0,3}\right\}\\
&+ a^2b^3\left\{-\frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{2,0}T_{3,0}-2(1+Z)T_{0,3}\partial_y T_{2,0}\right\}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Psi_0^{(2)} = b^2\left\{-\Sigma_b\right\} &(3.56)\\
+\ & b^4\big\{-T_{0,2}\Delta S_{0,2}+\frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{0,2}^2+2(1+Z)T_{0,2}\partial_y T_{0,2}\\
-\ & S_{0,2}\Sigma_{0,2}+2(1+Z)S_{0,2}\partial_y S_{0,2}-\Lambda T_{0,3}\big\}\\
+\ & ab^2\left\{\frac{4Z(1+Z)}{y}T_1T_{0,2}-T_{1,0}\Delta S_{0,2}+2(1+Z)(T_{1,0}\partial_y T_{0,2}+T_{0,2}\partial_y T_{1,0})-\Lambda T_{1,1}+ZT_{0,2}\right\}\\
+\ & a^3\left\{\frac{4Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{2,0}T_{1,0}+2(1+Z)(\partial_y T_{2,0}T_{1,0}+T_{2,0}\partial_y T_{1,0})+ZT_{2,0}\right\}\\
+\ & a^2b^2\left\{-S_{0,2}HT_{2,0}+\frac{4Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{0,2}T_{2,0}-T_{2,0}\Delta S_{0,2}+2(1+Z)(\partial_y T_{0,2}T_{2,0}+T_{0,2}\partial_y T_{2,0})\right\}\\
+\ & a^4\left\{\frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{2,0}^2+2(1+Z)T_{2,0}\partial_y T_{2,0}\right\},
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Psi_0^{(3)} = b^3\left\{T_1\Sigma_b\right\} &(3.57)\\
+\ & a^2b\left\{-T_{1,0}\Sigma_{1,1}-T_{2,0}\Lambda\phi+T_{0,1}\Sigma_{2,0}\right\}\\
+\ & ab^3\left\{-T_{1,0}\Sigma_{0,3}-2(1+Z)T_{1,1}\partial_y S_{0,2}\right\}\\
+\ & a^3b\left\{-T_{2,0}\Sigma_{1,1}+T_{1,1}\Sigma_{2,0}\right\}\\
+\ & b^5\left\{-T_{0,2}\Sigma_{0,3}+T_{0,3}\Sigma_{0,2}-2(1+Z)T_{0,3}\partial_y S_{0,2}\right\}\\
+\ & a^2b^3\left\{-T_{2,0}\Sigma_{0,3}+T_{0,3}\Sigma_{2,0}\right\}
\end{aligned}$$

We estimate the error pointwise using the assumption

$$|a| \leq \frac{b}{|\mathrm{log} b|}$$

and the bounds on $T_{i,j}$. We first observe the high order cancellation near the origin:

$$|\Psi_0^{(1)}+C_1aby^3|+|\Psi_0^{(2)}+\frac{b^2}{|\mathrm{log}b|}y^3|+\frac{|\Psi_0^{(3)}|}{b}\lesssim\frac{b^2}{|\mathrm{log}b|}y^5\ \ \text{for}\ \ y\leq 1$$

for some universal constants C_1, C_2. We next estimate for $y\leq 2B_1$:

$$\Psi_0^{(1)}=ab\left\{-\Sigma_b\right\}+\frac{b^2}{|\mathrm{log}b|^2}O\left(y\mathbf{1}_{y\leq B_0}+(by^2)y\mathbf{1}_{B_0\leq y\leq 2B_1}\right), \tag{3.58}$$

$$\Psi_0^{(2)}=b^2\left\{-\Sigma_b\right\}+\frac{b^2}{|\mathrm{log}b|}O\left(y\mathbf{1}_{y\leq B_0}+(by^2)y\mathbf{1}_{B_0\leq y\leq 2B_1}\right), \tag{3.59}$$

$$\Psi_0^{(3)}=\frac{b^2}{|\mathrm{log}b|}O\left[(by^2)|\mathrm{log}y|^2\mathbf{1}_{y\leq 2B_1}\right]. \tag{3.60}$$

This yields the bound:

$$\int_{y\leq 2B_1}\frac{|\Psi_0^{(1)}|^2}{y^6}+\int_{y\leq 2B_1}\frac{|\Psi_0^{(2)}|^2}{y^6}+\frac{1}{b^2}\int_{y\leq 2B_1}\frac{|\Psi_0^{(3)}|^2}{y^8}\lesssim\frac{b^4}{|\mathrm{log}b|^2}.$$

Estimates for higher order derivatives and localized bounds are obtained similarily and (3.6), (3.8), (3.9) follow.

step 8 Estimate on $H\mathbf{\Psi}_0$.

We now aim at deriving improved estimates for $\Psi_0^{(i)}$, $i=1,2$. The construction of $T_{i,j}$ results in the following cancellations for $y\leq 2B_1$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& H\left(\Psi_0^{(1)}\right) = -ab\left\{c_b\chi_{\frac{B_0}{4}}\Lambda\phi-d_bH\left[(1-\chi_{3B_0})\Lambda\phi)\right]\right\}+ab^3\left\{\Sigma_{0,3}\right\}+a^2b\left\{\Sigma_{1,1}\right\}\\
+ \ & ab^3H\big\{T_{1,1}\Delta S_{0,2}-2(1+Z)T_{1,1}\partial_yT_{0,2}-(1+Z)T_{0,3}-2(1+Z)T_{0,3}\partial_yT_{1,0}+S_{0,2}\Sigma_{1,1}\\
- \ & \frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}(T_{1,0}T_{0,3}+T_{0,2}T_{1,1})\big\} \qquad (3.61)\\
+ \ & a^2bH\left\{-\frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{1,0}T_{1,1}-2(1+Z)T_{1,0}\partial_yT_{1,0}-(1+Z)T_{1,1}-\Lambda T_{0,2}\right.\\
- \ & \left.2\frac{Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{2,0}T_{0,1}-2(1+Z)T_{0,1}\partial_yT_{2,0}\right\}\\
+ \ & a^3bH\left\{-\frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{2,0}T_{1,1}-2(1+Z)T_{1,1}\partial_yT_{2,0}\right\}\\
+ \ & b^5H\left\{-\frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{0,2}T_{0,3}+T_{0,3}(\Delta S_{0,2}-2(1+Z)\partial_yT_{0,2})+S_{0,2}\Sigma_{0,3}\right\}\\
+ \ & a^2b^3H\left\{-\frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{2,0}T_{3,0}-2(1+Z)T_{0,3}\partial_yT_{2,0}\right\}\\
= \ & -ab\left\{c_b\chi_{\frac{B_0}{4}}\Lambda\phi-d_bH\left[(1-\chi_{3B_0})\Lambda\phi)\right]\right\}\\
+ \ & a^2bO\left[(1+y)\mathbf{1}_{y\leq 6B_0}+\frac{|\mathrm{log}y|^3}{1+y}\right]+ab^3O\left(\frac{1+y}{b|\mathrm{log}b|}+(1+y)|\mathrm{log}y|^2\right)\\
+ \ & a^3bO\left(\frac{|\mathrm{log}y|^3}{y}\right)++b^5O\left[(1+y^3)|\mathrm{log}y|^2\right]+a^2b^3O\left((1+y)|\mathrm{log}y|^3\right),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & H\left(\Psi_0^{(2)}\right) = b^2\left\{-c_b\chi_{\frac{B_0}{4}}\Lambda\phi + d_bH\left[(1-\chi_{3B_0})\Lambda\phi)\right]\right\} \qquad (3.62)\\ - \quad & b^4H(\Lambda T_{0,3}) - ab^2\left\{H\Lambda T_{1,1} - \Sigma_{0,2}\right\}\\ + \quad & b^4H\left\{-T_{0,2}\Delta S_{0,2} + 2(1+Z)T_{0,2}\partial_yT_{0,2} + \frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{0,2}^2 - S_{0,2}\Sigma_{0,2} + 2(1+Z)S_{0,2}\partial_yS_{0,2}\right\}\\ + \quad & ab^2H\left\{\frac{4Z(1+Z)}{y}T_1T_{0,2} - T_{1,0}\Delta S_{0,2} + 2(1+Z)(T_{1,0}\partial_yT_{0,2} + T_{0,2}\partial_yT_{1,0}) + (1+Z)T_{0,2}\right\}\\ + \quad & a^3H\left\{\frac{4Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{2,0}T_{1,0} + 2(1+Z)(\partial_yT_{2,0}T_{1,0} + T_{2,0}\partial_yT_{1,0}) + ZT_{2,0}\right\}\\ + \quad & a^2b^2H\left\{-S_{0,2}\Sigma_{2,0} + \frac{4Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{0,2}T_{2,0} - T_{2,0}\Delta S_{0,2} + 2(1+Z)(\partial_yT_{0,2}T_{2,0} + T_{0,2}\partial_yT_{2,0})\right\}\\ + \quad & a^4H\left\{\frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}T_{2,0}^2 + 2(1+Z)T_{2,0}\partial_yT_{2,0}\right\},\\ = \quad & b^2\left\{-c_b\chi_{\frac{B_0}{4}}\Lambda\phi + d_bH\left[(1-\chi_{3B_0})\Lambda\phi)\right]\right\} + a^3O\left(\frac{|\mathrm{log}y|^3}{1+y}\right)\\ - \quad & b^4\left\{H(\Lambda T_{0,3}) + O\left[(1+y)|\mathrm{log}y|^2\right]\right\} + ab^2O\left[(1+y)\mathbf{1}_{y\le 6B_0} + \frac{|\mathrm{log}y|^2}{1+y}\right]\\ + \quad & a^3O\left(\frac{|\mathrm{log}y|^2}{1+y}\right) + a^2b^2O\left(\frac{|\mathrm{log}y|^3}{y}\right) + a^4O\left(\frac{|\mathrm{log}y|^4}{1+y^3}\right). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, using (3.53), we obtain the bounds:

$$\int_{y\le 2B_1}|H\Psi_0^{(1)}|^2 + |H\Psi_0^{(2)}|^2 \lesssim \frac{b^4}{|\mathrm{log}b|^2}\left[|\mathrm{log}b| + (bB_1^2)^2\right] \lesssim b^4|\mathrm{log}b|^2,$$

$$\int_{y\le 2B_1}\frac{|H\Psi_0^{(1)}|^2 + |H\Psi_0^{(2)}|^2}{y^2} \lesssim \frac{b^4}{|\mathrm{log}b|^2},$$

and (3.10), (3.11) are proved.
We now turn to the flux computation (3.13), (3.14). From (3.62), (4.3):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(H(\Psi_0^{(2)}),\Phi_M)}{(\Lambda\phi,\Phi_M)} &= \frac{1}{(\Lambda\phi,\Phi_M)}\left[\left(-b^2c_b\chi_{\frac{B_0}{4}}\Lambda\phi,\Phi_M\right) + O\left(C(M)b^3\right)\right]\\ &= -c_bb^2 + O\left(C(M)b^2\right) = -\frac{2b^2}{|\mathrm{log}b|} + O\left(\frac{b^2}{|\mathrm{log}b|^2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

and similarily from (3.61):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(H(\Psi_0^{(1)}),\Phi_M)}{(\Lambda\phi,\Phi_M)} &= \frac{1}{(\Lambda\phi,\Phi_M)}\left[\left(-abc_b\chi_{\frac{B_0}{4}}\Lambda\phi,\Phi_M\right) + O\left(C(M)b^3\right)\right]\\ &= -\frac{2ab}{|\mathrm{log}b|} + O\left(\frac{b^2}{|\mathrm{log}b|^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

step 9 H^4 estimates.

We estimate from (3.61), (3.62):

$$\int_{y\le 2B_1}|H^2\Psi_0^{(1)}|^2 + \int_{y\le 2B_1}|H^2\Psi_0^{(2)}|^2 \lesssim \frac{b^6}{|\mathrm{log}b|^2} + b^8\int_{y\le B_1}|H^2(\Lambda T_{0,3})|^2.$$

The estimate (3.12) will follow from the bound

$$b^8\int_{y\leq B_1}|H^2(\Lambda T_{0,3})|^2\lesssim \frac{b^6}{|\text{log}b|^2} \tag{3.63}$$

Proof of (3.63): We compute using (3.54):

$$H(\Lambda T_{0,3})=2\Sigma_{0,3}+\Lambda\Sigma_{0,3}-\frac{\Lambda V}{y^2}T_{0,3},$$

$$H^2(\Lambda T_{0,3})=H\left(2\Sigma_{0,3}+\Lambda\Sigma_{0,3}\right)+O\left(\frac{1}{1+y}\right).$$

Furthermore, from (3.49):

$$\begin{array}{rcl} H(\Sigma_{0,3}) & = & -H\left(T_{0,1}\Delta S_{0,2}-2(1+Z)T_{0,1}\partial_yT_{0,2}-\Lambda T_{0,2}+2T_{0,2}\right)\\ & = & H(\Lambda T_{0,2}-2T_{0,2})+O\left(\dfrac{(\text{log}y)^3}{y}\right)\\ & = & \Lambda\Sigma_{0,2}+O\left(\dfrac{(\text{log}y)^5}{y}\right)\end{array}$$

and thus by rescaling:

$$H(\Lambda\Sigma_{0,3})=2\Lambda\Sigma_{0,2}+\Lambda^2\Sigma_{0,2}+O\left(\frac{(\text{log}y)^5}{y}\right).$$

Using the bounds (3.36), (3.37) we conclude that

$$\begin{array}{rl} & b^8\displaystyle\int_{y\leq B_1}|H^2(\Lambda T_{0,3})|^2\\ \lesssim & \dfrac{b^8}{|\text{log}b|^2}\left[\displaystyle\int_{y\leq 6B_0}(1+y^2)(1+|\text{log}(y\sqrt{b})|)^2+\int_{6B_0\leq y\leq 2B_1}\frac{(\text{log}y)^4}{y^2}\right]+b^8\displaystyle\int_{y\leq 2B_1}\frac{(\text{log}y)^{10}}{1+y^2}\\ \lesssim & \dfrac{b^6}{|\text{log}b|^2}\end{array}$$

as desired for (3.63).
This concludes the proof of Proposition 3.1.

3.1. **Localization of the profile.**

In this section, we modify the approximate profile $\mathbf{w}_0$ constructed above to obtain a slowly modulated blow up profile *localized* in the zone $y\leq 2B_1$.

Proposition 3.4 (Localized profile)**.** *Let a $\mathcal{C}^1$ map $s\to(b(s),a(s))\in\mathbb{R}_+^*\times\mathbb{R}$ defined on $[0,s_0]$ with a priori bounds: $\forall s\in[0,s_0]$,*

$$|a|\leq\frac{b}{|\text{log}b|},\quad 0<b<b^*,\quad |a_s|\leq\frac{b^2}{|\text{log}b|},\quad |b_s|\leq 10b^2. \tag{3.64}$$

We define the localized profile

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0=\left|\begin{array}{l}\tilde{\alpha}_0\\ \tilde{\beta}_0\\ \tilde{\gamma}_0\end{array}\right.=\chi_{B_1}\mathbf{w}_0$$

defined from the cut-off profiles:

$$\tilde{T}_{i,j}=\chi_{B_1}T_{i,j},\quad \tilde{T}_1=\chi_{B_1}T_1,\quad \tilde{S}_{0,2}=\chi_{B_1}S_{0,2}.$$

and the modulation vector:

$$
\begin{aligned}
Mod(t) := Mod(s,y) \;&=\; -a_s \left| \begin{array}{l} \tilde{T}_1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array} \right. - (b_s+b^2) \left| \begin{array}{l} 2b\tilde{T}_{0,2} \\ \tilde{T}_1 \\ 2b\tilde{S}_{0,2} \end{array} \right. \qquad (3.65)\\
&+ \left(\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}+b\right) \left| \begin{array}{l} \Lambda\phi + \Lambda\tilde{\alpha}_0 + \tilde{\gamma}_0\Lambda\phi \\ \Lambda\tilde{\beta}_0 \\ \Lambda\tilde{\gamma}_0 - \tilde{\alpha}_0\Lambda\phi \end{array} \right. - (\Theta_s+a) \left| \begin{array}{l} -\tilde{\beta}_0 Z \\ \Lambda\phi + \tilde{\alpha}_0 Z + \tilde{\gamma}_0\Lambda\phi \\ -\tilde{\beta}_0\Lambda\phi \end{array} \right.
\end{aligned}
$$

The profile $\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0$ *satisfies the equation:*

$$
-\partial_s\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0 + \frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}\Lambda\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0 - \Theta_s ZR\widetilde{\mathbf{w}} - (e_z+\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0)\wedge \left[\mathbb{H}\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0 + \Lambda\phi \left| \begin{array}{l} \Theta_s \\ \frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda} \\ 0 \end{array} \right. \right] = Mod(t) + \tilde{\mathbf{\Psi}}_0 \quad (3.66)
$$

with the bounds:

$$
|\tilde{\Psi}_0|^2 \lesssim \frac{b^2}{|\log b|^2}, \qquad (3.67)
$$

$$
\int \frac{|\partial_y^i \tilde{\Psi}_0^{(1)}|^2}{y^{6-2i}} + \int \frac{|\partial_y^i \tilde{\Psi}_0^{(2)}|^2}{y^{6-2i}} \lesssim \frac{b^4}{|\log b|^2}, \quad 0 \le i \le 3, \qquad (3.68)
$$

$$
\int \frac{|\partial_y^i \tilde{\Psi}_0^{(3)}|^2}{y^{8-2i}} \lesssim \frac{b^6}{|\log b|^2}, \quad 0 \le i \le 4, \qquad (3.69)
$$

$$
\int |H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(1)}|^2 + |H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(2)}|^2 \lesssim b^4|\log b|^2, \qquad (3.70)
$$

$$
\int \frac{|\partial_y^i H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(1)}|^2}{y^{2-2i}} + \frac{|\partial_y^i H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(2)}|^2}{y^{2-2i}} \lesssim \frac{b^4}{|\log b|^2}, \quad 0 \le i \le 1, \qquad (3.71)
$$

$$
\int |AH\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(i)}|^2 \lesssim b^5, \quad i=1,2, \qquad (3.72)
$$

$$
\int |H^2\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(i)}|^2 \lesssim \frac{b^6}{|\log b|^2}, \quad i=1,2, \qquad (3.73)
$$

$$
\frac{(H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(2)}, \Phi_M)}{(\Lambda\phi, \Phi_M)} = -\frac{2b^2}{|\log b|} + O\left(\frac{b^2}{|\log b|^2}\right), \qquad (3.74)
$$

$$
\frac{(H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(1)}, \Phi_M)}{(\Lambda\phi, \Phi_M)} = -\frac{2ab}{|\log b|} + O\left(\frac{b^2}{|\log b|^2}\right). \qquad (3.75)
$$

Proof of Proposition 3.4

step 1 Equation for $\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0$.

We first compute:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}\Lambda\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0 - \Theta_s ZR\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0 - (e_z+\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0)\wedge \left[\Lambda\phi \left| \begin{array}{l} \Theta_s \\ \frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda} \\ 0 \end{array} \right. \right] = -b\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0 + aZR\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0 - (e_z+\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0)\wedge \left[\Lambda\phi \left| \begin{array}{l} -a \\ -b \\ 0 \end{array} \right. \right]\\
&+ \left(\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}+b\right) \left| \begin{array}{l} \Lambda\phi + \Lambda\tilde{\alpha}_0 + \tilde{\gamma}_0\Lambda\phi \\ \Lambda\tilde{\beta}_0 \\ \Lambda\tilde{\gamma}_0 - \tilde{\alpha}_0\Lambda\phi \end{array} \right. - (\Theta_s+a) \left| \begin{array}{l} -Z\tilde{\beta}_0 \\ \Lambda\phi + Z\tilde{\alpha}_0 + \tilde{\gamma}_0\Lambda\phi \\ -\tilde{\beta}_0\Lambda\phi \end{array} \right. ,
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$-\partial_s\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0 = \ - \ a_s\left|\begin{array}{l}\tilde{T}_1+2a\tilde{T}_{2,0}\\ b\tilde{T}_{1,1}\\ 0\end{array}\right. \\ \qquad - \ b_s\left|\begin{array}{l}2b\tilde{T}_{0,2}+b^2\frac{\partial\tilde{T}_{0,2}}{\partial b}+a^2\frac{\partial\tilde{T}_{2,0}}{\partial b}\\ \tilde{T}_1+b\frac{\partial\tilde{T}_1}{\partial b}+3b^2\tilde{T}_{0,3}+b^3\frac{\partial\tilde{T}_{0,3}}{\partial b}+a\tilde{T}_{1,1}+ab\frac{\partial\tilde{T}_{1,1}}{\partial b}\\ 2b\tilde{S}_{0,2}+b^2\frac{\partial\tilde{S}_{0,2}}{\partial b}\end{array}\right. .$$

Combining this with (3.65) we have the explicit formula (3.66) for $\tilde{\Psi}_0$:

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}_0=\mathbf{E}_1+\mathbf{E}_2$$

with

$$\mathbf{E}_1=-a_s\left|\begin{array}{l}2a\tilde{T}_{2,0}\\ b\tilde{T}_{1,1}\\ 0\end{array}\right. -b_s\left|\begin{array}{l}b^2\frac{\partial\tilde{T}_{0,2}}{\partial b}+a^2\frac{\partial\tilde{T}_{2,0}}{\partial b}\\ b\frac{\partial\tilde{T}_1}{\partial b}+3b^2\tilde{T}_{0,3}+b^3\frac{\partial\tilde{T}_{0,3}}{\partial b}+a\tilde{T}_{1,1}+ab\frac{\partial\tilde{T}_{1,1}}{\partial b}\\ b^2\frac{\partial\tilde{S}_{0,2}}{\partial b}\end{array}\right. , \tag{3.76}$$

$$\mathbf{E}_2=-b\Lambda\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0+aZR\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0-(e_z+\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0)\wedge\left[\mathbb{H}\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0-\Lambda\phi\left|\begin{array}{l}a\\ b\\ 0\end{array}\right.\right]+\left|\begin{array}{l}2b(b^2+a^2)\tilde{T}_{0,2}\\ (b^2+a^2)\tilde{T}_1+a(b^2+a^2)\tilde{T}_{1,1}\\ 2b(b^2+a^2)\tilde{S}_{0,2}\end{array}\right. . \tag{3.77}$$

step 2 Modulation error term $\mathbf{E}_1$.

From (3.28),

$$\frac{\partial c_b}{\partial b}=O\left(\frac{1}{b|\log b|^2}\right), \ \ \frac{\partial \log c_b}{\partial b}=O\left(\frac{1}{b|\log b|}\right),$$

and thus

$$\frac{\partial\Sigma_b}{\partial b}(y) \ = \ \frac{\partial c_b}{\partial b}T_1\mathbf{1}_{y\leq\frac{B_0}{8}}+O\left(\frac{1}{b^2y|\log b|}\mathbf{1}_{\frac{B_0}{8}\leq y\leq 6B_0}\right),$$

which yields the bound:

$$\frac{\partial\Sigma_b}{\partial b}(y)=O\left(\frac{y}{b|\log b|}\mathbf{1}_{y\leq 6B_0}\right). \tag{3.78}$$

We now estimate using the explicit formula for $T_{i,j}$:

$$\frac{\partial\tilde{T}_{0,2}}{\partial b}=O\left(\frac{1+y^3}{b|\log b|}\mathbf{1}_{y\leq B_0}\right)+O\left(\frac{1+y}{b^2|\log b|}\mathbf{1}_{B_0\leq y\leq 2B_1}\right).$$

$$\frac{\partial\tilde{T}_{1,1}}{\partial b}=O\left(\frac{1+y^3}{b|\log b|}\mathbf{1}_{y\leq B_0}\right)+O\left(\frac{1+y}{b^2|\log b|}\mathbf{1}_{B_0\leq y\leq B_1}\right),$$

$$\frac{\partial\tilde{T}_{0,3}}{\partial b}=O\left(\frac{1+y^5}{b|\log b|}\mathbf{1}_{y\leq B_0}\right)+O\left(\frac{1+y^3}{b^2|\log b|}\mathbf{1}_{B_0\leq y\leq B_1}\right),$$

$$\frac{\partial\tilde{T}_{2,0}}{\partial b}=O\left(\frac{(1+y)|\log y|^3}{b}\mathbf{1}_{B_0\leq y\leq 2B_0}\right),$$

$$\frac{\partial\tilde{S}_{0,2}}{\partial b}=O\left(\frac{y^2|\log y|^2}{b}\mathbf{1}_{B_1\leq y\leq 2B_1}\right).$$

We therefore obtain

$$|\mathbf{E}_1^{(1)}|+|\mathbf{E}_1^{(2)}|\lesssim b^2\left[O\left(\frac{1+y}{|\log b|}\mathbf{1}_{y\leq 2B_1}\right)+O\left(\frac{by^3}{|\log b|}\mathbf{1}_{B_0\leq y\leq 2B_1}\right)\right],$$

$$|\mathbf{E}_1^{(3)}| \lesssim O\left(b^3 y^2 |\log y|^2 \mathbf{1}_{B_1 \le y \le 2B_1}\right)$$

which gives the bounds

$$\int \frac{|\partial_y^i \mathbf{E}_1^{(1)}|^2}{y^{6-2i}} + \int \frac{|\partial_y^i \mathbf{E}_i^{(2)}|^2}{y^{6-2i}} \lesssim \frac{b^4}{|\log b|^2}, \quad 0 \le i \le 3,$$

$$\int |H\mathbf{E}_1^{(1)}|^2 + \int |H\mathbf{E}_1^{(2)}|^2 \lesssim \frac{b^4}{|\log b|^2}(bB_1^2)^2 \le b^4 |\log b|^2,$$

$$\int \frac{|\partial_y^i \mathbf{E}_1^{(3)}|^2}{y^{8-2i}} \lesssim \frac{b^6}{|\log b|^2}, \quad 0 \le i \le 4.$$

These estimates show that $\mathbf{E}_1$ is negligible for $y \le M$ in the flux computation (3.74), (3.75).

We now seek additional cancellations for $H^2\mathbf{E}_1$. We have:

$$H^2\left(\frac{\partial \tilde{T}_{0,2}}{\partial b}\right) = \chi_{B_1} H^2\left(\frac{\partial T_{0,2}}{\partial b}\right) + O\left(\frac{1+y}{y^4 b^2 |\log b|}\mathbf{1}_{B_1 \le y \le 2B_1}\right).$$

By construction,

$$\begin{aligned} H^2(\frac{\partial T_{0,2}}{\partial b}) &= H(\frac{\partial \Sigma_{0,2}}{\partial b}) = H(\frac{\partial \Sigma_b}{\partial b}) \\ &= O\left(\frac{1}{b(1+y)|\log b|^2}\mathbf{1}_{y \le 6B_0}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{b(1+y)|\log b|}\mathbf{1}_{B_0 \le y \le 6B_0}\right) \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$H^2\left(\frac{\partial \tilde{T}_{0,2}}{\partial b}\right) = O\left(\frac{\mathbf{1}_{y \le 6B_0}}{b(1+y)|\log b|^2}\right) + O\left(\frac{\mathbf{1}_{B_0 \le y \le 6B_0}}{b(1+y)|\log b|}\right) + O\left(\frac{1+y}{y^4 b^2 |\log b|}\mathbf{1}_{B_1 \le y \le 2B_1}\right).$$

Similarily,

$$H^2(\frac{\partial T_{1,1}}{\partial b}) = O\left(\frac{\mathbf{1}_{y \le 6B_0}}{b(1+y)|\log b|^2}\right) + O\left(\frac{\mathbf{1}_{B_0 \le y \le 6B_0}}{b(1+y)|\log b|}\right) + O\left(\frac{1+y}{y^4 b^2 |\log b|}\mathbf{1}_{B_1 \le y \le 2B_1}\right).$$

Finally,

$$H^2(\frac{\partial \tilde{T}_{0,3}}{\partial b}) = \chi_{B_1} H^2\left(\frac{\partial T_{0,3}}{\partial b}\right) + O\left(\frac{1+y^3}{y^4 b^2 |\log b|}\mathbf{1}_{B_1 \le y \le 2B_1}\right)$$

and

$$H^2(\frac{\partial T_{0,3}}{\partial b}) = H(\frac{\partial \Sigma_{0,3}}{\partial b}) = O\left(\frac{y}{b|\log b|}\mathbf{1}_{y \le B_0}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{b^2 y |\log b|}\mathbf{1}_{B_0 \le y \le 6B_0}\right).$$

We then obtain

$$H^2(\frac{\partial \tilde{T}_{0,3}}{\partial b}) = O\left(\frac{y}{b|\log b|}\mathbf{1}_{y \le B_0}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{b^2 y |\log b|}\mathbf{1}_{B_0 \le y \le 6B_0}\right) + O\left(\frac{1+y^3}{y^4 b^2 |\log b|}\mathbf{1}_{B_1 \le y \le 2B_1}\right).$$

Using the bound:

$$|H^2(\tilde{T}_{2,0})| + |H^2(\tilde{T}_{1,1})| \lesssim \frac{1}{(1+y)|\log b|}\mathbf{1}_{y \le 6B_0} + O\left(\frac{|\log y|^2}{1+y^3}\mathbf{1}_{B_1 \le y \le 2B_1}\right)$$

we derive the pointwise bound:

$$\begin{aligned} &|H^2\mathbf{E}_1^{(1)}| + |H^2\mathbf{E}_1^{(2)}| \lesssim \frac{b^3}{|\log b|} O\left(\frac{|\log y|^2}{1+y^3}\right) \\ &+ O\left(\frac{b^3 \mathbf{1}_{y \le 6B_0}}{(1+y)|\log b|^2}\right) + O\left(\frac{b^3 \mathbf{1}_{B_0 \le y \le 6B_0}}{(1+y)|\log b|}\right) + O\left(\frac{b^3}{y|\log b|}\mathbf{1}_{B_1 \le y \le 2B_1}\right) \end{aligned}$$

and therefore the desired improvement:

$$\int |H^2\mathbf{E}_1^{(1)}|^2+\int |H^2\mathbf{E}_1^{(2)}|^2\lesssim \frac{b^6}{|\text{log}b|^2}.$$

step 3 Localization error $\mathbf{E}_2$.

Let $\mathbf{E}_2$ be given by (3.77). In view of (3.5), E_2 contains all the error terms induced by the localization. With the exception of $(1-\chi_{B_1}\Lambda\phi)$ all the localization error terms are supported in the region $[B_1,2B_1]$. Using the formulas (3.17), (3.18), the bounds on $T_{i,j}$ and (3.58), (3.59), (3.60) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}_2^{(1)} &= \chi_{B_1}\Psi_0^{(1)}-b\,(1-\chi_{B_1})\Lambda\phi+b\,O\left(\frac{|\text{log}b|}{B_1}\mathbf{1}_{B_1\leq y\leq 2B_1}\right)+b^3\,O\left(\frac{B_1}{b}\mathbf{1}_{B_1\leq y\leq 2B_1}\right)\\ &+ ab\,O\left(B_1|\text{log}b|\mathbf{1}_{B_1\leq y\leq 2B_1}\right)+\frac{b^2}{|\text{log}b|}O\left[(by^2)y\mathbf{1}_{B_1\leq y\leq 2B_1}\right]\\ &= \chi_{B_1}\Psi_0^{(1)}+O\left(b^2B_1\mathbf{1}_{B_1\leq y\leq 2B_1}\right)+O\left(\frac{b^3y^3}{|\text{log}b|}\mathbf{1}_{B_1\leq y\leq 2B_1}\right)+O\left(\frac{b}{y}\mathbf{1}_{y\geq B_1}\right), \qquad (3.79)\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}_2^{(2)} &= \chi_{B_1}\Psi_0^{(2)}+a(1-\chi_{B_1})\Lambda\phi+aO\left(\frac{|\text{log}b|}{B_1}\mathbf{1}_{B_1\leq y\leq 2B_1}\right)+b^2O\left(B_1|\text{log}b|\mathbf{1}_{B_1\leq y\leq 2B_1}\right)\\ &+ a^2\left(\frac{|\text{log}b|^3}{B_1}\mathbf{1}_{B_1\leq y\leq 2B_1}\right)+O\left(\frac{b^3y^3}{|\text{log}b|}\mathbf{1}_{B_1\leq y\leq 2B_1}\right)\\ &= \chi_{B_1}\Psi_0^{(2)}+O\left(b^2|\text{log}b|B_1\mathbf{1}_{B_1\leq y\leq 2B_1}\right)+O\left(\frac{b^3y^3}{|\text{log}b|}\mathbf{1}_{B_1\leq y\leq 2B_1}\right)+O\left(\frac{b}{y}\mathbf{1}_{y\geq B_1}\right), \quad (3.80)\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}_2^{(3)} &= \chi_{B_1}\Psi_0^{(3)}+ab\,O\left(\frac{y|\text{log}y|}{1+y}\mathbf{1}_{B_1\leq y\leq 2B_1}\right)+b^3O\left(\frac{y}{b|\text{log}b|(1+y)}\mathbf{1}_{B_1\leq y\leq 2B_1}\right)\\ &+ \frac{b^2}{|\text{log}b|}O\left((by^2)^3|\text{log}y|^2\mathbf{1}_{B_0\leq y\leq 2B_1}\right). \qquad (3.81)\end{aligned}$$

Higher order derivatives are estimated similarily. We then easily check from there that $\mathbf{E}_2$ that does not perturb the estimates (3.68)–(3.75).
Finally, the estimate (3.72) follows by interpolating between (3.70) and (3.73):

$$\int |AH\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(i)}|^2=\int A^*AH\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(i)}\,H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(i)}\leq\left(\int |H^2\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(i)}|^2\right)^{\frac12}\left(\int |H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(i)}|^2\right)^{\frac12}.$$

This concludes the proof of Proposition 3.4.

4. The bootstrap regime and Lyapunov control

We derive in this section the dynamical tools at the heart of the description of the blow up solutions for initial data close to Q_{b_0,a_0}. We in particular set up the bootstrap argument, compute the modulation equations and derive the mized Energy/Morawetz functional which is our main tool to measure dispersion.

4.1. Bootstrap setup and orthogonality conditions.

Given a sufficiently large constant $M>0$, define the function:

$$\Phi_M=\chi_M\Lambda\phi-c_MH(\chi_M\Lambda\phi) \qquad (4.1)$$

with

$$c_M=\frac{(\chi_M\Lambda\phi,T_1)}{(H(\chi_M\Lambda\phi),T_1)}=c_\chi\frac{M^2}{4}(1+o_{M\to+\infty}(1)).$$

The choice of the constant c_M ensures that

$$\int |\Phi_M|^2 \lesssim |\log M|, \quad (\Phi_M, T_1) = 0 \tag{4.2}$$

and that the scalar products

$$(\Lambda\phi, \Phi_M) = (HT_1, \Phi_M) = (\chi_M \Lambda\phi, \Lambda\phi) = 4\log M(1 + o_{M\to+\infty}(1)) \tag{4.3}$$

are non degenerate. We recall the localized approximate profile

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0 = \left| \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\alpha}_0 \\ \tilde{\beta}_0 \\ \tilde{\gamma}_0 \end{array} \right. ,$$

dependent on the time-dependent parameters $a(t), b(t)$, given by Proposition 3.4 and consider the full modulated profile

$$e^{\Theta R}(Q + \widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0)_\lambda,$$

determined by the four parameters (λ, Θ, a, b). By the standard modulation theory, following from the application of the implicit function theorem, the invertibility of the Jacobian matrix:

$$\left| \begin{array}{llll} (-\Lambda\phi, \Phi_M) & 0 & (H\Lambda\phi, \Phi_M) & 0 \\ 0 & (\Lambda\phi, \Phi_M) & 0 & (H\Lambda\phi, \Phi_M) \\ (T_1, \Phi_M) & 0 & (HT_1, \Phi_M) & 0 \\ 0 & (T_1, \Phi_M) & 0 & (HT_1, \Phi_M) \end{array} \right| = (\Lambda\phi, \Phi_M)^4 \neq 0$$

at $(\lambda, \Theta, a, b) = (1, 0, 0, 0)$ ensures that any smooth map close enough to Q in the $\dot{H}^1$ topology admits a unique decomposition

$$u = \mathcal{S}(Q + v)(t, x) \tag{4.4}$$

with v expressed in the Frenet basis associated to $\mathcal{S}Q$ in the form

$$v = \mathbf{w} + \widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0, \quad \mathbf{w} = \left| \begin{array}{l} \alpha \\ \beta \\ \gamma \end{array} \right. , \quad \widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0 = \left| \begin{array}{l} \tilde{\alpha}_0 \\ \tilde{\beta}_0 \\ \tilde{\gamma}_0 \end{array} \right. , \tag{4.5}$$

and where he coordinate functions (α, β) are chosen to satisfy the orthogonality conditions:

$$(\alpha, \Phi_M) = (\beta, \Phi_M) = 0, \quad (H\alpha, \Phi_M) = (H\beta, \Phi_M) = 0. \tag{4.6}$$

Remark 4.1. *The non-degeneracy of the above Jacobian also implies that any map*

$$u = \mathcal{S}(Q + \widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0 + \mathbf{w})$$

with $\mathcal{S}$ *and* $\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0$ *defined by the parameters* (λ, Θ, a, b) *close to the point* $(1, 0, 0, 0)$ *and* $\mathbf{w}$ *such that* $\mathbf{w}$ *is small in the* $\dot{H}^1$ *topology and* $\|\mathbf{w}\|_{\dot{H}^1(y\le 2M)} \le C(M)b^{10}$ *admits a new decomposition*

$$u = \mathcal{S}^{(1)}(Q + \widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0^{(1)} + \mathbf{w}^{(1)})$$

defined by the parameters $(\lambda^{(1)}, \Theta^{(1)}, a^{(1)}, b^{(1)})$ *with* $\mathbf{w}^{(1)}$ *satisfying the orthogonality conditions* (4.6). *The map* $(\lambda, \Theta, a, b) \to (\lambda^{(1)}, \Theta^{(1)}, a^{(1)}, b^{(1)})$ *is a diffeomorphism of the form*

$$(\lambda^{(1)}, \Theta^{(1)}, a^{(1)}, b^{(1)}) = (\lambda, \Theta, a, b) + \Psi(\lambda, \Theta, a, b)$$

with the property that $\|\Psi(\lambda, \Theta, a, b)\|_{C^1} \le C(M)b^{10}$. *In particular, if we allow the parameter* a *to vary in the range* $|a| \le \frac{b}{2|\log b|}$ *then the range of values of the adjusted parameter* $a^{(1)}$ *will contain at least the interval* $[-\frac{b}{4|\log b|}, \frac{b}{4|\log b|}]$.

Let

$$\mathbf{w}^{\perp} = \left| \begin{array}{l} \alpha \\ \beta \\ 0 \end{array} \right.$$

We now introduce the Sobolev norms adapted to the linear operator $\mathbb{H}$:

$$\mathcal{E}_2 = \int |\mathbb{A}^*\mathbb{A}\mathbf{w}^{\perp}|^2, \quad \mathcal{E}_4 = \int |(\mathbb{A}^*\mathbb{A})^2\mathbf{w}^{\perp}|^2. \tag{4.7}$$

Here,

$$\mathbb{A}^*\mathbb{A}\mathbf{w}^{\perp} = \left| \begin{array}{l} H\alpha \\ H\beta \\ 0 \end{array} \right. ,$$

see (2.27), (2.28).

We make the following assumptions on the initial data:

- Control of $a(0), b(0)$:

$$0 < b(0) < b^*(M) \ll 1, \quad |a(0)| \leq \frac{b(0)}{4|\log b(0)|}. \tag{4.8}$$

  Moreover, we may up to a fixed rescaling on data assume:

$$\lambda(0) = 1.$$

- Energy control of $\mathbf{w}(0)$:

$$\int |\nabla \mathbf{w}(0)|^2 + \int \left|\frac{\mathbf{w}(0)}{y}\right|^2 \leq \delta(b^*) \ll 1, \tag{4.9}$$

$$|\mathcal{E}_2(0)| + |\mathcal{E}_4(0)| \leq b(0)^{10}, \tag{4.10}$$

  where here and in the sequel, $\delta(b^*)$ denotes some generic constant with

$$\delta(b^*) \to 0 \ \text{ as } \ b^* \to 0. \tag{4.11}$$

The propagation of regularity by the equivariant Schrödinger map flow ensures that these bounds are propagated on some small time interval $[0, t_1)$. Given a large enough universal constant $K > 0$, independent of M, we assume the following bounds: $\forall t \in [0, t_1]$,

- Pointwise control of a, b:

$$0 < b(t) \leq Kb^*(M), \quad |a(t)| \leq \frac{b(t)}{|\log b(t)|}; \tag{4.12}$$

- Energy control of $\mathbf{w}(t)$:

$$\int |\nabla \mathbf{w}(t)|^2 + \int \left|\frac{\mathbf{w}(t)}{y}\right|^2 \leq K\delta(b^*), \tag{4.13}$$

$$|\mathcal{E}_2(t)| \leq Kb^2(t)|\log b(t)|^7, \tag{4.14}$$

$$|\mathcal{E}_4(t)| \leq K\frac{b^4(t)}{|\log b(t)|^2}. \tag{4.15}$$

At the heart of our analysis is the statement that these bounds are propagated all the way to blow up time, or equivalently:

Proposition 4.2 (Trapped regime)**.** *Assume that K has been chosen large enough, independent of M. Then we can find*

$$a(0)=a(b(0),w(0))\in[-\frac{b(0)}{4|\log b(0)|},\frac{a(0)}{4|\log b(0)|}$$

such that the corresponding solution to (1.1) *satisfies:* $\forall t\in[0,t_1)$,

- *Pointwise control of a by b:*

$$0<b(t)\leq\frac{K}{2}b^*(M),\quad |a(t)|\leq\frac{b(t)}{2|\log b(t)|};\tag{4.16}$$

- *Energy control of* $\mathbf{w}(t)$*:*

$$\mathcal{E}_1(t)=\int|\nabla\mathbf{w}(t)|^2+\int\left|\frac{\mathbf{w}(t)}{y}\right|^2\leq\frac{K}{2}\delta(b^*),\tag{4.17}$$

$$|\mathcal{E}_2(t)|\lesssim\frac{K}{2}b^2(t)|\log b(t)|^7,\tag{4.18}$$

and for some universal constant $\eta>0$, independent of M,

$$|\mathcal{E}_4(t)|\leq(1-\eta)K\frac{b^4(t)}{|\log b(t)|^2}.\tag{4.19}$$

Remark 4.3. *All along the proof of Proposition 4.2, we implicitely assume that M is some large enough parameter, and then this fixes the smallness of initial data through the constant $b^*=b^*(M)$ in* (4.8)*, and the smallness of $\delta(b^*)$ constants* (4.11) *which will appear all along the file. In particular, for a given generic constant $C(M)$, we can always assume*

$$C(M)\delta(b^*)\lesssim\delta(b^*)\to 0\quad \textit{as}\quad b^*=b^*(M)\to 0.$$

The rest of this section is devoted to the derivation of the Lyapunov type functional for $\mathbf{w}$, which in section 5.1 will be shown to lead to the proof of Proposition 4.2.

4.2. Vectorial equation in the Frenet basis.

We now consider the decomposition (4.4), (4.5) and recall from (2.23) the notation

$$\widehat{\mathbf{w}}=\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0+\mathbf{w}$$

and the normalization

$$|e_z+\widehat{\mathbf{w}}|^2=1.\tag{4.20}$$

We introduce the two matrices:

$$R_z=e_z\wedge,\quad \widehat{J}=(e_z+\widehat{\mathbf{w}})\wedge.\tag{4.21}$$

We write the equation for $\mathbf{w}$ in the Frenet basis using (2.24), (3.66):

$$\partial_s\mathbf{w}-\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}\Lambda\mathbf{w}+\Theta_s ZR\mathbf{w}=-\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}-\mathbf{w}\wedge\left[\mathbb{H}\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0+\Lambda\phi\left|\begin{array}{l}\Theta_s\\ \frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}\\ 0\end{array}\right.\right]+\text{Mod}(t)+\tilde{\mathbf{\Psi}}_0.\tag{4.22}$$

Let

$$\mathbf{f}=-\Theta_s ZR\mathbf{w}-\mathbf{w}\wedge\left[\mathbb{H}\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0+\Lambda\phi\left|\begin{array}{l}\Theta_s\\ \frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}\\ 0\end{array}\right.\right]+\text{Mod}(t)+\tilde{\mathbf{\Psi}}_0\tag{4.23}$$

which we rewrite in a more explicit form:

$$\mathbf{f}=-\Theta_s ZR\mathbf{w}+\mathrm{Mod}(t)+\tilde{\mathbf{\Psi}}_0-\mathbf{w}\wedge\left|\begin{array}{l}(\Theta_s\Lambda\phi+aH\tilde{T}_1)+b^2H\tilde{T}_{0,2}+a^2H\tilde{T}_{2,0}-2(1+Z)\partial_y\tilde{\gamma}_0\\ \left(\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}\Lambda\phi+bH\tilde{T}_1\right)+abH\tilde{T}_{1,1}+b^3H\tilde{T}_{0,3}\\ -\Delta\tilde{\gamma}_0-2(1+Z)(\partial_y+\frac{Z}{y})\tilde{\alpha}_0\end{array}\right. . \tag{4.24}$$

For the renormalized vector

$$\mathbf{W}(t,r)=\mathbf{w}(s,y),$$

we equivalently obtain the system in the original variables (t,r):

$$\partial_t\mathbf{W}=-\widehat{J}_\lambda\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{W}+\mathbf{F},\quad \mathbf{F}=\frac{1}{\lambda^2}\mathbf{f}_\lambda$$

with

$$\widehat{J}_\lambda=(e_z+\widehat{\mathbf{W}})\wedge,\quad \mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{W}=\left|\begin{array}{l}H_\lambda\alpha_\lambda\\ H_\lambda\beta_\lambda\\ -\Delta\gamma_\lambda\end{array}\right.+\frac{2(1+Z_\lambda)}{\lambda}\left|\begin{array}{l}-\partial_r\gamma_\lambda\\ 0\\ \partial_r\alpha_\lambda+\frac{Z_\lambda}{r}\alpha_\lambda\end{array}\right. .$$

The rescaled operators are given by:

$$A_\lambda=-\partial_r+\frac{Z_\lambda}{r},\quad A^*_\lambda=\partial_r+\frac{1+Z_\lambda}{r},\quad Z_\lambda(r)=Z\left(\frac{r}{\lambda}\right), \tag{4.25}$$

$$H_\lambda=A^*_\lambda A_\lambda=-\Delta+\frac{V_\lambda}{r^2},\quad V_\lambda(r)=V\left(\frac{r}{\lambda}\right). \tag{4.26}$$

4.3. **Computation of the modulation equations.** In this section we derive the modulation equations for (λ,Θ,a,b) with the error terms controlled in terms of the appropriate powers of the parameter b and the energy $\mathcal{E}_4$.

Lemma 4.4 (Modulation equations)**.** *There holds the following bounds on the modulation parameters:*

$$|\Theta_s+a|+|\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}+b|\lesssim O\left(C(M)b^3\right), \tag{4.27}$$

$$\left|b_s+b^2\left(1+\frac{2}{|\mathrm{log} b|}\right)\right|+|a_s+\frac{2ab}{|\mathrm{log} b|}|\lesssim\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{log} M}}\left(\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_4}+\frac{b^2}{|\mathrm{log} b|}\right). \tag{4.28}$$

Remark 4.5. *The* $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{log} M}}$ *smallness gain in* (4.28) *will be crucial for the rest of the analysis.*

Proof of Lemma 4.4

step 1 Equations for a,b.

Let

$$U(t)=|b_s+b^2|+|\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}+b|+|\Theta_s+a|+|a_s|. \tag{4.29}$$

We project (4.22) onto the first two coordinates, commute the resulting system with H and then take the L^2 scalar product of each equation with Φ_M. The linear terms $\partial_s(H\alpha,\Phi_M)$ and $\partial_s(H\beta,\Phi_M)$ vanish thanks to the choice of orthogonality conditions (4.6). Next, we observe from (3.65) that on the support of Φ_M, i.e., for $y\leq 2M$:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Mod}(s,y) &= -a_s\left|\begin{array}{l}T_1\\0\\0\end{array}\right. -(b_s+b^2)\left|\begin{array}{l}0\\T_1\\0\end{array}\right. +\left(\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}+b\right)\left|\begin{array}{l}\Lambda\phi\\0\\0\end{array}\right. -(\Theta_s+a)\left|\begin{array}{l}0\\\Lambda\phi\\0\end{array}\right.\\ &+ O\left(C(M)b|U(t)|\right).\end{aligned}$$

All nonlinear terms in (4.22) are estimated by brute force in the zone $y\leq 2M$ using the bounds of Appendix B, and we obtain the system:

$$\begin{aligned}&(H^2\beta,\Phi_M)-a_s(HT_1,\Phi_M)+(H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(1)},\Phi_M)\\ &= C(M)b\,O\left(\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_4}+\frac{b^2}{|\mathrm{log}b|}+|U(t)|\right),\end{aligned}\tag{4.30}$$

$$-(H^2\alpha,\Phi_M)-(b_s+b^2)(HT_1,\Phi_M)+(H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(2)},\Phi_M)=C(M)b\,O\left(\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_4}+\frac{b^2}{|\mathrm{log}b|}+|U(t)|\right).$$

We now observe from (4.2):

$$|(H^2\alpha,\Phi_M)|+|H^2\beta,\Phi_M)|\lesssim\left[\|H^2\alpha\|_{L^2}+\|H^2\beta\|_{L^2}\right]\sqrt{\mathrm{log}M}\leq\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_4}\sqrt{8\mathrm{log}M}$$

from the definition of $\mathcal{E}_4$. The flux computation (3.74), (3.75) and the growth (4.3) now imply

$$\left|a_s+\frac{2ab}{|\mathrm{log}b|}\right|+\left|b_s+b^2+\frac{2b^2}{|\mathrm{log}b|}\right|\lesssim O\left(\frac{b^2}{|\mathrm{log}b||\sqrt{\mathrm{log}M}}+\sqrt{b}|U(t)|\right)\tag{4.31}$$

for $|b|<b^*(M)$ small enough.

step 2 Control of the parameters λ,Θ.

We project (4.22) onto the first two coordinates and take the L^2 scalar product of each equation with Φ_M. The linear terms $\partial_s(\alpha,\Phi_M)$, $\partial_s(\beta,\Phi_M)$, $(H\alpha,\Phi_M)$ and $(H\beta,\Phi_M)$ vanish thanks to the choice of the orthogonality conditions (4.6). The cancellation $(\Phi_M,T_1)=0$ of (4.2) also eliminates the contribution of the leading order terms involving a_s, b_s+b^2. Treating the nonlinear terms, crudely, by the estimates of Appendix B, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}(\Lambda\phi,\Phi_M)\left(|\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}+b|+|\Theta_s+a|\right) &\lesssim \left|(\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(1)},\Phi_M)\right|+\left|(\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(2)},\Phi_M)\right|\\ &+ C(M)b\,O\left(\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_4}+|U(t)|\right).\end{aligned}\tag{4.32}$$

We now compute from (3.55), (3.56) and (3.30) for $i=1,2$:

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(i)},\Phi_M)\right| &\lesssim b^2\left|(\Sigma_b,\Phi_M)\right|+O(C(M)b^3)=c_bb^2\left|(T_1,\Phi_M)\right|+O(C(M)b^3)\\ &= O(C(M)b^3).\end{aligned}$$

Injecting this into (4.32) yields together with (4.31) the estimates (4.27), (4.28). This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.4.

4.4. **Mixed Energy/Morawetz Lyapounov functional.** We now turn to the heart of the proof which is the bootstrap control of the $\mathcal{E}_4$ norm

$$\mathcal{E}_4=\int|H^2\mathbf{w}^{\perp}|^2.$$

This will be done through the derivation of a suitable mixed energy/Morawetz identity.

Proposition 4.6 (Mixed energy/Morawetz estimate)**.** *We have the following differential inequality*

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}\left\{\frac{1}{\lambda^6}\left[\mathcal{E}_4(1-\delta(b^*))+O\left(\frac{b^4}{\log b^2}\right)\right]\right\} \\ \leq\ &\frac{b}{\lambda^8}\left[2\left(1-d_0+\frac{C}{\sqrt{\log M}}\right)\mathcal{E}_4+O\left(\frac{b^4}{|\log b|^2}\right)\right]\end{aligned}\tag{4.33}$$

with constants independent of M and

$$0<d_0<1.\tag{4.34}$$

Proof of Proposition 4.6

step 1 Vectorial formulation and adapted derivatives.

Recall the notations (4.21). We begin by introducing the suitable second derivative of $\mathbf{W}$:

$$\mathbf{W}_2:=\widehat{J}_\lambda\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{W}.$$

The $\mathbf{W}$ equation:

$$\partial_t\mathbf{W}=-\mathbf{W}_2+F$$

yields the equation for $\mathbf{W}_2$:

$$\partial_t\mathbf{W}_2=-\widehat{J}_\lambda\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{W}_2+[\partial_t,\widehat{J}_\lambda\mathbb{H}_\lambda]\mathbf{W}+\widehat{J}_\lambda\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{F}.$$

We then decompose

$$\mathbf{W}=\mathbf{W}^{\perp}+W^ze_z,\quad \mathbf{W}^{\perp}=-R_z^2\mathbf{W},\quad W^z=\mathbf{W}\cdot e_z.$$

We note the following formulas used extensively below:

$$\mathbb{A}R_z=R_z\mathbb{A},\qquad \mathbb{A}^*R_z=R_z\mathbb{A}^*,\qquad R_z\mathbb{H}R_z=R_z\mathbb{A}^*\mathbb{A}R_z.$$

We now rewrite

$$[\partial_t,\widehat{J}_\lambda\mathbb{H}_\lambda]\mathbf{W}=\partial_t\widehat{\mathbf{W}}\wedge\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{W}+\widehat{\mathbf{W}}\wedge[\partial_t,\mathbb{H}_\lambda]\mathbf{W}+R_z[\partial_t,\mathbb{H}_\lambda]\mathbf{W}\tag{4.35}$$

so that

$$\partial_t\mathbf{W}_2=-\widehat{J}_\lambda\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{W}_2+R_z[\partial_t,\mathbb{H}_\lambda]\mathbf{W}+\mathcal{Q}_1+\widehat{J}_\lambda\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{F}\tag{4.36}$$

with

$$\mathcal{Q}_1=\partial_t\widehat{\mathbf{W}}\wedge\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{W}+\widehat{\mathbf{W}}\wedge[\partial_t,\mathbb{H}_\lambda]\mathbf{W}.$$

step 2 Energy identity for $\mathbf{W}_2$.

We now proceed to the derivation of a (second derivative) energy identity on the $\mathbf{W}_2$ equation. As was mentioned earlier, the quasilinear nature of the system of equations for $\mathbf{W}$ can lead to a potential loss of derivatives in energy estimates. To avoid this loss we have already introduced a nonlinear quantity $\mathbf{W}_2$ and will now control the time derivative of a nonlinear second derivative of $\mathbf{W}_2$. We compute

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\left\{\int |\widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2|^2\right\} = -\int \widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2 \cdot \left[\widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda \widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2\right] + \int \widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2 \cdot (\widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda)^2 \mathbf{F} \\
+ &\int \widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2 \cdot \left[[\partial_t, \widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda]\mathbf{W}_2 + \widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda \left\{R_z[\partial_t, \mathbb{H}_\lambda]\mathbf{W} + \mathcal{Q}_1\right\}\right] \\
= &-\int \widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2 \cdot \left[\widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda \widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2\right] + \int \widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2 \cdot (\widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda)^2 \mathbf{F} \\
+ &\int R_z \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2 \cdot \left[[\partial_t, \widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda]\mathbf{W}_2 + \widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda \left\{R_z[\partial_t, \mathbb{H}_\lambda]\mathbf{W}\right\}\right] \\
+ &\int \widehat{\mathbf{W}} \wedge \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2 \cdot \left[[\partial_t, \widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda]\mathbf{W}_2 + \widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda \left(R_z[\partial_t, \mathbb{H}_\lambda]\mathbf{W}\right)\right] + \int \widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2 \cdot \widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathcal{Q}_1
\end{aligned}$$

Let us introduce the decomposition of $\mathbf{W}_2$:

$$\mathbf{W}_2 = \mathbf{W}_2^0 + \mathbf{W}_2^1, \quad \mathbf{W}_2^0 = R_z \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}^\perp. \tag{4.37}$$

We have the following identities:

$$\begin{aligned}
R_z[\partial_t, \mathbb{H}_\lambda]\mathbf{W} &= \frac{\partial_t V_\lambda}{r^2} R_z \mathbf{W}^\perp - 2\frac{\lambda^2 \partial_t Z_\lambda - \lambda\lambda_t(1+Z_\lambda)}{\lambda^3}\partial_r W^z e_y, \\
R_z[\partial_t, \mathbb{H}_\lambda] W^z e_z &= -2\frac{\lambda^2 \partial_t Z_\lambda - \lambda\lambda_t(1+Z_\lambda)}{\lambda^3}\partial_r W^z e_y.
\end{aligned}$$

We rewrite

$$\partial_t V_\lambda = -\frac{1}{\lambda^2}\left(\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda} + b\right)(\Lambda V)_\lambda + \frac{b}{\lambda^2}(\Lambda V)_\lambda$$

and use the expansion (4.35) to obtain the energy identity:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\left\{\int |\widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2|^2\right\} = -\int \widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2 \cdot \left[\widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda \widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2\right] + \int \widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2 \cdot (\widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda)^2 \mathbf{F} \\
+ &\int R_z \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2^0 \cdot \left[\frac{b(\Lambda V)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r^2} R_z \mathbf{W}_2^0 + R_z \mathbb{H}_\lambda \left(\frac{b(\Lambda V)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r^2} R_z \mathbf{W}^\perp\right)\right] \\
+ &\mathcal{Q}_2 + \int \widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2 \cdot \widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathcal{Q}_1
\end{aligned} \tag{4.38}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Q}_2 = &\int R_z \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2^0 \cdot \left[-\left(\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda} + b\right)\frac{(\Lambda V)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r^2} R_z \mathbf{W}_2^0 + R_z \mathbb{H}_\lambda \left(-\left(\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda} + b\right)\frac{(\Lambda V)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r^2} R_z \mathbf{W}^\perp\right)\right] \\
+ &\int R_z \mathbb{H}_\lambda (\mathbf{W}_2^1) \cdot \left[R_z[\partial_t, \mathbb{H}_\lambda]\mathbf{W}_2^0 + R_z \mathbb{H}_\lambda \left(R_z[\partial_t, \mathbb{H}_\lambda]\mathbf{W}^\perp\right)\right] \\
+ &\int R_z \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2 \cdot \left[R_z[\partial_t, \mathbb{H}_\lambda](\mathbf{W}_2^1) + R_z \mathbb{H}_\lambda \left(R_z[\partial_t, \mathbb{H}_\lambda](\mathbf{W}^z e_z)\right)\right] \\
+ &\int R_z \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2 \cdot \left[\partial_t \widehat{\mathbf{W}} \wedge \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2 + \widehat{\mathbf{W}} \wedge [\partial_\tau, \mathbb{H}_\lambda]\mathbf{W}_2 + \widehat{\mathbf{W}} \wedge \mathbb{H}_\lambda (R_z[\partial_t, \mathbb{H}_\lambda]\mathbf{W})\right] \\
+ &\int \widehat{\mathbf{W}} \wedge \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2 \cdot \left[[\partial_t, \widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda]\mathbf{W}_2 + \widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda \left\{R_z[\partial_t, \mathbb{H}_\lambda]\mathbf{W}\right\}\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{4.39}$$

step 3 Morawetz correction for the remaining quadratic interactions.

The second line of the energy identity (4.38) still contains unsigned quadratic terms. To remove them we add another identity reminiscent, in spirit, to the

Morawetz identity for the Schrödinger equation.
Let

$$\mathbf{W}_3 = R_z \mathbb{A}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2^0, \quad \mathbb{A}_\lambda \mathbf{W} = \left| \begin{array}{l} A_\lambda(\mathbf{W}\cdot e_x) \\ A_\lambda(\mathbf{W}\cdot e_y) \\ 0 \end{array} \right. \tag{4.40}$$

Note that

$$R_z \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2^0 = \mathbb{A}_\lambda^* \mathbf{W}_3.$$

We compute from $\mathbf{W}^\perp = -R_z^2 \mathbf{W}$:

$$\partial_t \mathbf{W}^\perp = -R_z^2(-\mathbf{W}_2 + \mathbf{F}) = -\mathbf{W}_2^0 + R_z^2 \mathbf{W}_2^1 + \mathbf{F}^\perp \tag{4.41}$$

$$\partial_t \mathbf{W}_2^0 = -R_z \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2^0 + \mathcal{Q}_3 + R_z \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{F}^\perp \tag{4.42}$$

with

$$\mathcal{Q}_3 = [\partial_t, R_z \mathbb{H}_\lambda]\mathbf{W}^\perp + R_z \mathbb{H}_\lambda (R_z^2 \mathbf{W}_2^1). \tag{4.43}$$

We then proceed with the following Morawetz type computation:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt}\left\{ \int \left[2\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}\mathbf{W}_2^0 + \mathbb{A}_\lambda \left(\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2} R_z \mathbf{W}^\perp \right) \right] \cdot \mathbf{W}_3 \right\} \\ = & \int \left[2\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}\partial_t \mathbf{W}_2^0 + \mathbb{A}_\lambda \left(\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2} R_z \partial_t \mathbf{W}^\perp \right) \right] \cdot \mathbf{W}_3 \\ + & \int \left[2\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}\mathbf{W}_2^0 + \mathbb{A}_\lambda \left(\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2} R_z \mathbf{W}^\perp \right) \right] \cdot R_z \mathbb{A}_\lambda \partial_t \mathbf{W}_2^0 \\ + & \mathcal{Q}_4 \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}_4 = & \int \left[2\frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r} \right) \mathbf{W}_2^0 + \frac{\partial_t Z_\lambda b(\Lambda V)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r^3} R_z \mathbf{W}^\perp + \mathbb{A}_\lambda \left(\frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{b(\Lambda V)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r^2} \right) \mathbf{W}^\perp \right) \right] \cdot \mathbf{W}_3 \\ + & \int \left[2\frac{\partial_t Z_\lambda}{r}\mathbf{W}_2^0 + \mathbb{A}_\lambda \left(\frac{\partial_t V_\lambda}{r^2} R_z \mathbf{W}^\perp \right) \right] \cdot R_z \frac{\partial_t Z_\lambda}{r}\mathbf{W}_2^0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.44}$$

We now inject (4.42) and compute the leading order quadratic terms:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \left[2\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}(-R_z \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2^0) + \mathbb{A}_\lambda \left(\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2}(-R_z W_2^0) \right) \right] \cdot \mathbf{W}_3 \\ = & -2\int \frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r} A_\lambda^* \mathbf{W}_3 \cdot \mathbf{W}_3 - \int \frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2} R_z \mathbf{W}_2^\perp \cdot R_z \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2^0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \left[2\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}\mathbf{W}_2^0 + \mathbb{A}_\lambda \left(\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2} R_z \mathbf{W}^\perp \right) \right] \cdot R_z \mathbb{A}_\lambda (-R_z \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2^0) \\ = & \int \left[-2\mathbb{A}_\lambda^* \left(\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}\mathbf{W}_2^0 \right) - \mathbb{H}_\lambda \left(\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2} R_z \mathbf{W}^\perp \right) \right] \cdot R_z^2 \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2^0 \\ = & \int \left[2\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r} \mathbb{A}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2^0 - 2\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2}\mathbf{W}_2^0 - \mathbb{H}_\lambda \left(\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2} R_z \mathbf{W}^\perp \right) \right] \cdot R_z^2 \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2^0 \\ = & -2\int \frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r} A_\lambda^* \mathbf{W}_3 \cdot \mathbf{W}_3 - 2\int \frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2}\mathbf{W}_2^0 \cdot R_z^2 \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2^0 \\ - & \int \mathbb{H}_\lambda \left(\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2} R_z \mathbf{W}^\perp \right) \cdot R_z^2 \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2^0. \end{aligned}$$

Here we used the algebra associated with the function Z:

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_y(\partial_y Z)+\frac{1}{y^2}\Lambda Z(1+2Z) &= \frac{1}{y^2}\left(\Lambda^2 Z-\Lambda Z+\Lambda Z(1+2Z)\right)\\
&= \frac{1}{y^2}\left[\Lambda^2 Z+2Z\Lambda Z\right]=\frac{\Lambda V}{y^2},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that for any function f:

$$\begin{aligned}
A^*_\lambda\left(\frac{\Lambda Z}{y}f\right) &= -A_\lambda\left(\frac{\Lambda Z}{y}f\right)+\frac{1+2Z}{y}\frac{\Lambda Z}{y}f\\
&= -\frac{\Lambda Z}{y}Af+\frac{f}{y^2}\left[\partial_y\left(\frac{\Lambda Z}{y}\right)+\frac{1+2Z}{y}\frac{\Lambda Z}{y}\right]\\
&= -\frac{\Lambda Z}{y}Af+\frac{\Lambda V}{y^2}f.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarily, the algebra

$$\Lambda Z=Z^2-1\leq 0,\quad -\frac{1}{2}\Lambda^2 Z+Z\Lambda Z=0,$$

implies, after an integration by parts:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}\mathbb{A}^*_\lambda\mathbf{W}_3\cdot\mathbf{W}_3 &= \frac{b}{\lambda^8}\int\frac{|\mathbf{w}_3|^2}{y^2}\left[-\frac{y}{2}\partial_y(\Lambda Z)+(1+Z)\Lambda Z\right]\\
&= \int\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r^2}|\mathbf{W}_3|^2<0.
\end{aligned}\tag{4.45}$$

We therefore obtain the Morawetz type formula:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}\left\{\int\left[2\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}\mathbf{W}_2^0+\mathbb{A}_\lambda\left(\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2}R_z\mathbf{W}^\perp\right)\right]\cdot\mathbf{W}_3\right\}\\
=\ & -4\int\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}|\mathbf{W}_3|^2+\int\left[\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2}R_z\mathbf{W}_2^0+R_z\mathbb{H}_\lambda\left(\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2}R_z\mathbf{W}^\perp\right)\right]\cdot R_z\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{W}_2^0\\
+\ & \mathcal{Q}_4\\
+\ & \int\left[2\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}(\mathcal{Q}_3+R_z\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{F}^\perp)+\mathbb{A}_\lambda\left(\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2}R_z[R_z^2W_2^1+\mathbf{F}^\perp]\right)\right]\cdot\mathbf{W}_3\\
+\ & \int\left[2\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}\mathbf{W}_2^0+\mathbb{A}_\lambda\left(\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2}R_z\mathbf{W}^\perp\right)\right]\cdot R_z\mathbb{A}_\lambda\left(\mathcal{Q}_3+R_z\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{F}^\perp\right)\\
=\ & -4\int\frac{|\mathbf{W}_3|^2}{r^2}\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}+\int\left[\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2}R_z\mathbf{W}_2^0+R_z\mathbb{H}_\lambda\left(\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2}R_z\mathbf{W}^\perp\right)\right]\cdot R_z\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{W}_2^0\\
+\ & \mathcal{Q}_4+\mathcal{Q}_5\\
+\ & \int R_z\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{F}^\perp\cdot\left[2\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}\mathbf{W}_3-2R_z\mathbb{A}^*_\lambda\left(\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}\mathbf{W}_2^0\right)-\mathbb{H}_\lambda\left(\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2}\mathbf{W}^\perp\right)\right]\\
+\ & \int\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2}R_z\mathbf{F}^\perp\cdot\mathbb{A}^*_\lambda W_3
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Q}_5 \;&=\; \int \left[2\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}\mathcal{Q}_3 - \mathbb{A}_\lambda\left(\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2}R_z\mathbf{W}_2^1\right)\right]\cdot \mathbf{W}_3 \qquad (4.46)\\
&+\; \int \left[2\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}\mathbf{W}_2^0 + \mathbb{A}_\lambda\left(\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2}R_z\mathbf{W}^\perp\right)\right]\cdot \mathbb{A}_\lambda R_z\mathcal{Q}_3\\
&=\; \int \mathbf{W}_3\cdot\left[\left(2\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}\right)\left([\partial_t, R_z\mathbb{H}_\lambda]\mathbf{W}^\perp + R_z\mathbb{H}_\lambda(R_z^2\mathbf{W}_2^1)\right) - \mathbb{A}_\lambda\left(\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2}R_z\mathbf{W}_2^1\right)\right]\\
&+\; \int R_z\left[\partial_t, R_z\mathbb{H}_\lambda]\mathbf{W}^\perp + R_z\mathbb{H}_\lambda(R_z^2\mathbf{W}_2^1)\right]\cdot\mathbb{A}_\lambda^*\left[2\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}\mathbf{W}_2^0 + \mathbb{A}_\lambda\left(\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2}R_z\mathbf{W}^\perp\right)\right]
\end{aligned}$$

step 4 Mixed energy/Morawetz Lyapunov functional.

We combine the energy identity and the Morawetz identity and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\left\{\int|\widehat{J}_\lambda\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{W}_2|^2 - 2\int\left[\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}\mathbf{W}_2^0 + \mathbb{A}_\lambda\left(\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2}R_z\mathbf{W}^\perp\right)\right]\cdot\mathbf{W}_3\right\}\\
=\;& -\int\widehat{J}_\lambda\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{W}_2\cdot\left[\widehat{J}_\lambda\mathbb{H}_\lambda\widehat{J}_\lambda\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{W}_2\right] + 4\int\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}|\mathbf{W}_3|^2 \qquad (4.47)\\
+\;& \mathcal{Q}_2 + \int\widehat{J}_\lambda\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{W}_2\cdot\widehat{J}_\lambda\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathcal{Q}_1 + \mathcal{Q}_4 + \mathcal{Q}_5\\
+\;& \int\widehat{J}_\lambda\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{W}_2\cdot(\widehat{J}_\lambda\mathbb{H}_\lambda)^2\mathbf{F} + \int\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2}R_z\mathbf{F}^\perp\cdot\mathbb{A}_\lambda^*\mathbf{W}_3\\
+\;& \int R_z\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{F}^\perp\cdot\left[2\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}\mathbf{W}_3 - 2R_z\mathbb{A}_\lambda^*\left(\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}\mathbf{W}_2^0\right) - \mathbb{H}_\lambda\left(\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2}R_z\mathbf{W}^\perp\right)\right].
\end{aligned}$$

By (4.45), the leading order quadratic term has the right sign from (4.45). After dealing with the quasilinear term

$$\int\widehat{J}_\lambda\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{W}_2\cdot\left[\widehat{J}_\lambda\mathbb{H}_\lambda\widehat{J}_\lambda\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{W}_2\right],$$

we will aim at estimating all the remaining terms in the RHS of (4.47). In the process we will make an intensive implicit use of the interpolation estimates of Appendix B.

step 5 Quasilinear term.

The mixed energy/Morawetz identity (4.47) is compatible with the quasilinear structure of the problem thanks to the following:

Lemma 4.7 (Gain of two derivatives)**.** *There exists a universal constant*

$$0 < d_1 < 1 \qquad (4.48)$$

such that for any vector $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ *with radial coordinates in the Frenet basis, there holds:*

$$-\int\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}) \le b\left[(1-d_1)\|\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\|_{L^2}^2 + \delta(b^*)\|\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\|_{L^2}^2\right] \qquad (4.49)$$

Lemma 4.7 is crucial. Its proof is mostly algebraic and is detailed in Appendix C.

We now apply Lemma 4.7 with $\mathbf{\Gamma} = \mathbf{w}_2$. Observe from (6.75), (6.82) that

$$\|\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}_2\|_{L^2}^2 = \mathcal{E}_4 + \delta(b^*)\left(\mathcal{E}_4 + \frac{b^4}{|\text{log}b|^2}\right) \qquad (4.50)$$

and we thus, after rescaling, get the bound:

$$-\int \widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2 \cdot \left[\widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda \widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2\right] \leq \frac{b}{\lambda^8}\left[(1-d_0)\mathcal{E}_4 + \delta(b^*)\frac{b^4}{|\log b|^2}\right] \tag{4.51}$$

for some universal constant $0 < d_0 < 1$.

step 6 Control of the Lyapunov functional.

We estimate the Lyapunov functional

$$\left\{\int |\widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2|^2 - 2\int \left[\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}\mathbf{W}_2^0 + \mathbb{A}_\lambda\left(\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2}R_z\mathbf{W}^\perp\right)\right]\cdot \mathbf{W}_3\right\}$$

appearing on the left hand side in (4.47). From (4.50):

$$\int |\widehat{J}_\lambda \mathbb{H}_\lambda \mathbf{W}_2|^2 = \frac{1}{\lambda^6}\left[\mathcal{E}_4 + \delta(b^*)\left(\mathcal{E}_4 + \frac{b^4}{|\log b|^2}\right)\right].$$

Next,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\int \left[\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}\mathbf{W}_2^0 + \mathbb{A}_\lambda\left(\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2 r^2}R_z\mathbf{W}^\perp\right)\right]\cdot \mathbf{W}_3\right| \\
\lesssim\ & \frac{b}{\lambda^6}\left(\int |\mathbb{A}^*\mathbf{w}_3|^2 + \frac{|\mathbf{w}_3|^2}{y^2(1+|\log y|^2)}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\int \frac{1+|\log y|^2}{1+y^4}|\mathbf{w}_2^0|^2 + \int \frac{|\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2}{1+y^8}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
\lesssim\ & \frac{b}{\lambda^6}|\log b|^C\left(\mathcal{E}_4 + \frac{b^4}{|\log b|^2}\right) \lesssim \frac{\delta(b^*)}{\lambda^6}\left(\mathcal{E}_4 + \frac{b^4}{|\log b|^2}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the logarithmic lossy bounds (6.46).

step 7 Treatment of lower order $\mathcal{Q}$ terms.

To treat these terms, we will systematically use the bound:

$$|\Lambda Z| + |\Lambda V| \lesssim \frac{y^2}{1+y^4}.$$

We first estimate from the $\mathbf{W}$ equation:

$$\|\partial_t \mathbf{W}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \lesssim \|\mathbf{W}_2\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \|\mathbf{F}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \lesssim \|\mathbf{W}_2\|_{L^\infty}^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda^4}\|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^\infty}^2.$$

We estimate from the estimates of Appendix B:

$$\|\mathbf{W}_2\|_{L^\infty}^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{\lambda^4}b^3|\log b|^C,$$

and from (4.24):

$$\|\mathbf{f}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \lesssim \|\mathbf{w}\|_{L^\infty}^2\left(|\Theta_s|^2 + \frac{b^2}{|\log b|^2}\right) + \frac{b^2}{|\log b|^2} \lesssim \frac{b^2}{|\log b|^2}.$$

Therefore,

$$\|\partial_t \mathbf{W}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \lesssim \frac{b^2}{\lambda^4|\log b|^2}. \tag{4.52}$$

We now estimate one by one all terms appearing in (4.39) with the help of the bounds in Appendix B and (4.52):

$$\lambda^8|\mathcal{Q}_2| \lesssim \left|\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda} + b\right| b^4|\log b|^C + b\delta(b^*)\left(\mathcal{E}_4 + \frac{b^4}{|\log b|^2}\right) \lesssim b\delta(b^*)\left(\mathcal{E}_4 + \frac{b^4}{|\log b|^2}\right).$$

Similarily, from (4.44) and $|b_s|\lesssim b^2$:

$$\lambda^8|\mathcal{Q}_4|\lesssim(|b_s|+b^2)b^4|\log b|^C+b\delta(b^*)\left(\mathcal{E}_4+\frac{b^4}{|\log b|^2}\right)\lesssim b\delta(b^*)\left(\mathcal{E}_4+\frac{b^4}{|\log b|^2}\right),$$

and from (4.46):

$$\lambda^8|\mathcal{Q}_5|\lesssim b\delta(b^*)\left(\mathcal{E}_4+\frac{b^4}{|\log b|^2}\right).$$

step 8 F terms.

We rewrite the last line of (4.47) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}&\int R_z\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{F}^\perp\cdot\left[2\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}\mathbf{W}_3-2R_z\mathbb{A}^*_\lambda\left(\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}\mathbf{W}^0_2\right)-\mathbb{H}_\lambda\left(\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2r^2}R_z\mathbf{W}^\perp\right)\right]\\ = &\int R_z\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{F}^\perp\cdot 2\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}\mathbf{W}_3-2\int\mathbb{A}_\lambda R_z\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{F}^\perp\cdot R_z\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}\mathbf{W}^0_2\\ - &\int\mathbb{A}_\lambda R_z\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{F}^\perp\cdot\mathbb{A}_\lambda\left(\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2r^2}R_z\mathbf{W}^\perp\right).\end{aligned}$$

The **F** contribution to (4.47) is estimated by Cauchy-Schwarz :

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\int\widehat{J}_\lambda\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{W}_2\cdot(\widehat{J}_\lambda\mathbb{H}_\lambda)^2\mathbf{F}+\int\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2r^2}R_z\mathbf{F}^\perp\cdot\mathbb{A}^*_\lambda\mathbf{W}_3\right.\\ + &\left.\int R_z\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{F}^\perp\cdot\left[2\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}\mathbf{W}_3-2R_z\mathbb{A}^*_\lambda\left(\frac{b(\Lambda Z)_\lambda}{\lambda^2 r}\mathbf{W}^0_2\right)-\mathbb{H}_\lambda\left(\frac{b(\Lambda V_\lambda)}{\lambda^2r^2}R_z\mathbf{W}^\perp\right)\right]\right|\\ \lesssim &\frac{b}{\lambda^8}\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_4}\left[\frac{1}{b^2}\int|(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H})^2\mathbf{f}|^2+\int\frac{|\mathbf{f}^\perp|^2}{1+y^8}+\int\frac{1+|\log y|^2}{1+y^4}|R_z\mathbb{H}\mathbf{f}^\perp|^2\right]^{\frac12}\\ + &\frac{b}{\lambda^8}\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_4}C(M)\left[\int\frac{1+|\log y|^2}{1+y^2}|\mathbb{A}R_z\mathbb{H}\mathbf{f}^\perp|^2\right]^{\frac12},\end{aligned}$$

where the terms involving $\mathbf{W}_3$ do not require a $C(M)$ constant thanks to the coercivity of the operator $\mathbb{A}^*$, combined with the two dimensional Hardy inequality:

$$\mathcal{E}_4=\|\mathbb{A}^*\mathbf{w}_3\|^2_{L^2}\gtrsim\int|\partial_y\mathbf{w}_3|^2+\int\frac{|\mathbf{w}_3|^2}{1+y^4}\gtrsim\int|\partial_y\mathbf{w}_3|^2+\int\frac{|\mathbf{w}_3|^2}{y^2(1+|\log y|^2)}.$$

The same applies to the term containing $\widehat{J}_\lambda\mathbb{H}_\lambda\mathbf{W}_2$, thanks to the estimate (6.83) of Appendix B.
We now claim:

$$\int\frac{|\mathbf{f}^\perp|^2}{1+y^8}+\int\frac{1+|\log y|^2}{1+y^4}|R_z\mathbb{H}\mathbf{f}^\perp|^2\lesssim\frac{b^4}{|\log b|^2}+\frac{\mathcal{E}_4}{\sqrt{|\log M|}},\tag{4.53}$$

and the improved bound:

$$\frac{1}{b^2}\int|(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H})^2\mathbf{f}|^2+\frac{1}{\delta(b^*)}\int\frac{1+|\log y|^2}{1+y^2}|\mathbb{A}R_z\mathbb{H}\mathbf{f}^\perp|^2\lesssim\frac{b^4}{|\log b|^2}+\frac{\mathcal{E}_4}{\log M},\tag{4.54}$$

which together with the above chain of estimates concludes the proof of (4.33). It thus remains to prove (4.53), (4.54).
We recall the expression (4.24) for **f**:

$$\mathbf{f}=-\Theta_sZR\mathbf{w}+\mathrm{Mod}(t)+\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}_0-\mathbf{w}\wedge\left|\begin{array}{l}(\Theta_s\Lambda\phi+aH\tilde{T}_1)+b^2H\tilde{T}_{0,2}+a^2H\tilde{T}_{2,0}-2(1+Z)\partial_y\tilde{\gamma}_0\\ \left(\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}\Lambda\phi+bH\tilde{T}_1\right)+abH\tilde{T}_{1,1}+b^3H\tilde{T}_{0,3}\\ -\Delta\tilde{\gamma}_0-2(1+Z)(\partial_y+\frac{Z}{y})\tilde{\alpha}_0\end{array}\right..$$

step 9 $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}_0$ contribution.

We claim the fundamental estimate:

$$\int |(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H})^2\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}_0|^2 \lesssim \frac{b^6}{|\log b|^2}. \tag{4.55}$$

The remaining estimates involving $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}_0$ in (4.53), (4.54) follow directly from the estimates of Proposition 3.4 and are left to the reader. In particular, we note that the second part of (4.54) follows immediately from (3.72).

Proof of (4.55): We decompose $\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}_0 = \mathcal{C}_1 + \mathcal{C}_2$ with

$$\mathcal{C}_1 = e_z \wedge \mathbb{H}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}_0 = \left| \begin{array}{l} -H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(2)} \\ H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(1)} - 2(1+Z)\partial_y\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(3)} \\ 0 \end{array} \right. ,$$

$$\mathcal{C}_2 = \widehat{\mathbf{w}}\wedge\mathbb{H}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}_0 = \left| \begin{array}{l} \hat{\beta}(-\Delta\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(3)} + 2(1+Z)(\partial_y + \frac{Z}{y})\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(1)}) - \hat{\gamma}H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(2)} \\ \hat{\gamma}(H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(1)} - 2(1+Z)\partial_y\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(3)}) - \hat{\alpha}(-\Delta\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(3)} + 2(1+Z)(\partial_y + \frac{Z}{y})\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(1)}) \\ \hat{\alpha}H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(2)} - \hat{\beta}(H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(1)} - 2(1+Z)\partial_y\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(3)}) \end{array} \right.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \int |R_z\mathbb{H}\mathcal{C}_1|^2 &\lesssim \int |H^2\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(1)}|^2 + |H^2\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(1)}|^2 + \int \left|H\left((1+Z)\partial_y\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(3)}\right)\right|^2 \\ &\lesssim \frac{b^6}{|\log b|^2}, \end{aligned}$$

From Proposition 3.4, (6.56) and (6.66):

$$\begin{aligned} \int |\widehat{\mathbf{w}} \wedge \mathbb{H}\mathcal{C}_1|^2 &\lesssim \|\widehat{\mathbf{w}}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \frac{b^6}{|\log b|^2} + \int |\widehat{\mathbf{w}}|^2 \left|(1+Z)\left(\partial_y + \frac{Z}{y}\right)H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(2)}\right|^2 \\ &\lesssim \frac{b^6}{|\log b|^2} + \left\|\frac{\widehat{\mathbf{w}}}{1+y^2}\right\|_{L^\infty}^2 \int \left|\left(\partial_y + \frac{Z}{y}\right)H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(2)}\right|^2 \\ &\lesssim \frac{b^6}{|\log b|^2}. \end{aligned}$$

The $\mathcal{C}_2$ bound

$$\int |(e_z + \widehat{\mathbf{w}}) \wedge \mathbb{H}\mathcal{C}_2|^2 \lesssim \frac{b^6}{|\log b|^2}$$

can be obtained in a similar fashion. Indeed, we estimate

$$\int |(e_z+\widehat{\mathbf{w}})\wedge\mathbb{H}\mathcal{C}_2|^2 \lesssim (1+\|\widehat{\mathbf{w}}\|_{L^\infty})\left(\int_{y\le 1} \mathbb{H}\mathcal{C}_2|^2 + \int_{y\ge 1} \mathbb{H}\mathcal{C}_2|^2\right) \lesssim \int_{y\le 1} \mathbb{H}\mathcal{C}_2|^2 + \int_{y\ge 1} \mathbb{H}\mathcal{C}_2|^2.$$

We concentrate on the region $y \ge 1$ as estimates for $y \le 1$ are easier. According to Proposition 3.4, the terms $\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(3)}$ and $H^2\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(i)}$ with $i = 1, 2$ exhibit better behavior with respect to b. Thus we consider a generic contribution to $\mathbb{H}\mathcal{C}_2$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\left(\hat{\alpha}H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(2)}\right) &= \Delta\hat{\alpha}H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(2)} + \hat{\alpha}\Delta H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(2)} + 2\partial_y\hat{\alpha}\partial_y H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(2)} \\ &= \Delta\hat{\alpha}H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(2)} + \hat{\alpha}H^2\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(2)} - 2\partial_y\hat{\alpha}AH\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(2)} + H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(2)}O\left(\frac{|\hat{\alpha}|}{y^2} + \frac{|\partial_y\hat{\alpha}|}{y}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Using (3.73), (3.70), (6.49), (6.56) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{y\geq 1}|\Delta\hat{\alpha}H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(2)}|^2+\int_{y\geq 1}|\hat{\alpha}H^2\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(2)}|^2+\int_{y\geq 1}\left(\frac{|\hat{\alpha}|^2}{y^4}+\frac{|\partial_y\hat{\alpha}|^2}{y^2}\right)|H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(2)}|^2\\
&\qquad\lesssim \|\Delta\hat{\alpha}\|^2_{L^\infty(y\geq 1)}\int_{y\geq 1}|H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(2)}|^2+\|\hat{\alpha}\|^2_{L^\infty(y\geq 1)}\int_{y\geq 1}|H^2\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(2)}|^2\\
&\qquad+\left(\|\frac{\hat{\alpha}}{y^2}\|_{L^\infty(y\geq 1)}+\|\frac{\partial_y\hat{\alpha}}{y}\|_{L^\infty(y\geq 1)}\right)\int_{y\geq 1}|H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(2)}|^2\\
&\qquad\lesssim b^3|\text{log}b|^5b^4+\delta(b^*)\frac{b^6}{|\text{log}b|^2}+b^3|\text{log}b|^5b^4\lesssim\delta(b^*)\frac{b^6}{|\text{log}b|^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to estimate

$$\int|\partial_y\hat{\alpha}\,AH\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(2)}|^2\lesssim\|\partial_y\hat{\alpha}\|^2_{L^\infty}\int|AH\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(2)}|^2\lesssim b^2|\text{log}b|^8b^5\leq\delta(b^*)\frac{b^6}{|\text{log}b|^2},$$

where we used (3.72) and (6.55).

step 10 Mod(t) contribution.

We recall the definitions of $U(t)$ and Mod(t) given in (4.29) be given by (3.65) respectively:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Mod}(t)= &= -a_s\left|\begin{array}{l}\tilde{T}_1\\ 0\\ 0\end{array}\right. -(b_s+b^2)\left|\begin{array}{l}2b\tilde{T}_{0,2}\\ \tilde{T}_1\\ 2b\tilde{S}_{0,2}\end{array}\right.\\
&+\left(\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}+b\right)\left|\begin{array}{l}\Lambda\phi+\Lambda\tilde{\alpha}_0+\tilde{\gamma}_0\Lambda\phi\\ \Lambda\tilde{\beta}_0\\ \Lambda\tilde{\gamma}_0-\tilde{\alpha}_0\Lambda\phi\end{array}\right. -(\Theta_s+a)\left|\begin{array}{l}-\tilde{\beta}_0Z\\ \Lambda\phi+\tilde{\alpha}_0Z+\tilde{\gamma}_0\Lambda\phi\\ -\tilde{\beta}_0\Lambda\phi\end{array}\right.
\end{aligned}$$

We first estimate from (4.27) and (4.28):

$$\int\frac{|\text{Mod}(t)^\perp|^2}{1+y^8}+\int\frac{1+|\text{log}y|^2}{1+y^4}|R_z\mathbb{H}\text{Mod}(t)^\perp|^2\lesssim U^2(t)\lesssim\frac{b^4}{|\text{log}b|^2}+\frac{\mathcal{E}_4}{|\text{log}M|}.$$

Using the cancellation

$$AHT_1=A\Lambda\phi=0$$

we also have the improved bound:

$$\int\frac{1+|\text{log}y|^2}{1+y^2}|\mathbb{A}R_z\mathbb{H}\text{Mod}^\perp|^2\lesssim bU^2(t)\lesssim\delta(b^*)\left(\frac{b^4}{|\text{log}b|^2}+\delta(b^*)\mathcal{E}_4\right).$$

The estimate for

$$\frac{1}{b^2}\int|(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H})^2\text{Mod}|^2$$

is more involved. We first observe:

$$\text{Mod}=-\text{Mod}_1+\text{Mod}_2,\quad \text{Mod}_2=O\left[\left(\frac{b^2}{|\text{log}b|}+\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_4}\right)b(1+y)|\text{log}y|\mathbf{1}_{y\leq 2B_1}\right]$$

with

$$\text{Mod}_1=a_s\left|\begin{array}{l}\tilde{T}_1\\ 0\\ 0\end{array}\right.+(b_s+b^2)\left|\begin{array}{l}2b\tilde{T}_{0,2}\\ \tilde{T}_1\\ 0\end{array}\right.-\left(\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}+b\right)\left|\begin{array}{l}\Lambda\phi\\ 0\\ 0\end{array}\right.+(\Theta_s+a)\left|\begin{array}{l}0\\ \Lambda\phi\\ 0\end{array}\right..$$

The bound for Mod_2 follows from (3.65) and easily leads to the desired estimate. We focus on Mod_1. We compute:

$$\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\text{Mod}_1 = \left|\begin{array}{l} -(b_s+b^2)H\tilde{T}_1 \\ -a_sH\tilde{T}_1 - 2b(b_s+b^2)H\tilde{T}_{0,2} \\ 0 \end{array}\right. + \widehat{\mathbf{w}}\wedge O\left[U(t)\frac{|\text{log}y|}{1+y}\mathbf{1}_{y\leq 2B_1}\right]. \quad (4.56)$$

We now reapply the operator $\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}$. The second term in estimated by brute force using the estimates of Appendix B. For instance, using (6.47),

$$|U(t)|^2\int|\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2|H\frac{\text{log}y}{1+y}|^2 \lesssim \frac{b^4}{|\text{log}b|^2}\int\frac{|\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2|\text{log}y|^2}{1+y^6} \leq \frac{b^4}{|\text{log}b|^2}b^3|\text{log}b|^C \leq \frac{b^6}{|\text{log}b|^2}$$

For the first term:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}&\left|\begin{array}{l} -(b_s+b^2)H\tilde{T}_1 \\ -a_sH\tilde{T}_1 - 2b(b_s+b^2)H\tilde{T}_{0,2} \\ 0 \end{array}\right. = (e_z+\widehat{\mathbf{w}})\wedge\left|\begin{array}{l} -(b_s+b^2)H^2\tilde{T}_1 \\ -a_sH^2\tilde{T}_1 - 2b(b_s+b^2)H^2\tilde{T}_{0,2} \\ -2(b_s+b^2)(1+Z)(\partial_y+\frac{Z}{y})H\tilde{T}_1 \end{array}\right. \\ = \ & U(t)O\left[\frac{|\text{log}y|}{y^3}\mathbf{1}_{B_1\leq y\leq 2B_1} + b\left(\frac{\mathbf{1}_{y\leq 6B_0}}{(1+y)|\text{log}b|}+\frac{1}{1+y^2}\right)+\frac{|\widehat{\mathbf{w}}|}{1+y^4}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

As a result we obtain the bound

$$\int|(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H})^2\text{Mod}|^2 \lesssim b^2|U(t)|^2 \lesssim b^2\left(\frac{b^4}{|\text{log}b|^2}+\frac{\mathcal{E}_4}{\text{log}M}\right).$$

step 11 Contribution of the phase term.

Let

$$\mathbf{f}_1 = -\Theta_s Z R_z\mathbf{w},$$

then using the bootstrap assumptions on a and the modulation bounds of Lemma 4.4,

$$\begin{aligned} \int\frac{|\mathbf{f}_1^\perp|^2}{1+y^8} + \int\frac{1+|\text{log}y|^2}{1+y^4}|R_z\mathbb{H}\mathbf{f}_1^\perp|^2 &+ \int\frac{1+|\text{log}y|^2}{1+y^2}|AR_z\mathbb{H}\mathbf{f}_1^\perp|^2 + \int|(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H})^2\mathbf{f}_1|^2 \\ &\lesssim |\Theta_s|^2C(M)\mathcal{E}_4 \lesssim C(M)\frac{b^2}{|\text{log}b|^2}\mathcal{E}_4. \end{aligned}$$

Here, near the origin we used the decomposition $(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H})^2(ZR_z\mathbf{w}) = (\widehat{J}\mathbb{H})^2(R_z\mathbf{w}) + (\widehat{J}\mathbb{H})^2((Z-1)R_z\mathbf{w})$. The bound $|Z-1|\lesssim y^2$ eliminates a possible singularity at the origin, which may arise for instance from the term

$$\begin{aligned} H^2\left((Z-1)\alpha\right) &= H\left((Z-1)H\alpha - \partial_y^2(Z-1)\alpha - \frac{\partial_y(Z-1)}{y}\alpha - 2\partial_y(Z-1)\partial_y\alpha\right) \\ &= (Z-1)H^2\alpha - \partial_y^2(Z-1)H\alpha - \frac{\partial_y(Z-1)}{y}H\alpha \\ &- 2\partial_y(Z-1)\partial_yH\alpha - \partial_y^2(Z-1)H\alpha + \partial_y^4(Z-1)H\alpha + 2\partial_y^3(Z-1)\partial_y\alpha \\ &+ \frac{\partial_y^3(Z-1)}{y}\alpha - \frac{\partial_y(Z-1)}{y}H\alpha + \partial_y^2\frac{\partial_y(Z-1)}{y}\alpha + 2\partial_y\frac{\partial_y(Z-1)}{y}\partial_y\alpha \\ &+ \frac{1}{y}\partial_y\frac{\partial_y(Z-1)}{y}\alpha - 2\partial_y(Z-1)H\partial_y\alpha + 2\partial_y^3(Z-1)\partial_y\alpha \\ &+ 2\frac{\partial_y^2(Z-1)}{y}\partial_y\alpha + 4\partial_y^2(Z-1)\partial_y^2\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

The only terms singular at the origin appears in the commutator

$$\begin{array}{rl} & -2\partial_y(Z-1)H\partial_y\alpha \\ = & -2\partial_y(Z-1)\partial_yH\alpha + 2\dfrac{\partial_y(Z-1)}{y^2}\partial_y\alpha - 4\dfrac{\partial_y(Z-1)}{y^3}V\alpha + 2\dfrac{\partial_y(Z-1)}{y^2}\partial_yV\alpha \\ = & 2\partial_y(Z-1)\partial_yH\alpha + 2\dfrac{\partial_y(Z-1)}{y^2}\partial_yV\alpha - 4\dfrac{\partial_y(Z-1)}{y^3}(V-1)\alpha \\ + & 2\dfrac{\partial_y(Z-1)}{y^2}\partial_y\alpha - 4\dfrac{\partial_y(Z-1)}{y^3}\alpha, \end{array}$$

where due to the vanishing $|V-1|\lesssim y^2$ and $|\partial_yV|\lesssim y$ we only need to take into account the last two terms, and the term

$$2\frac{\partial_y^2(Z-1)}{y}\partial_y\alpha.$$

When combined, they generate

$$2\frac{\partial_y(Z-1)}{y^2}\partial_y\alpha - 4\frac{\partial_y(Z-1)}{y^3}\alpha + 2\frac{\partial_y^2(Z-1)}{y}\partial_y\alpha = 4\frac{\partial_y(Z-1)}{y^2}A\alpha + O(|\partial_y\alpha|)$$

The estimate

$$\int_{y\leq 1}\frac{|A\alpha|^2}{y^2}\lesssim C(M)\mathcal{E}_4$$

follows from (6.51). The estimates for $y\geq 1$ can be obtained in a similar fashion to the terms already treated above. We omit the details.

step 12 Contribution of the remaining term.

In view of (4.24), it remains to estimate the contribution of the term:

$$\mathbf{f}_2 = \mathbf{w}\wedge\left|\begin{array}{l} (\Theta_s\Lambda\phi + aH\tilde{T}_1) + b^2H\tilde{T}_{0,2} + a^2H\tilde{T}_{2,0} - 2(1+Z)\partial_y\tilde{\gamma}_0 \\ \left(\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}\Lambda\phi + bH\tilde{T}_1\right) + abH\tilde{T}_{1,1} + b^3H\tilde{T}_{0,3} \\ -\Delta\tilde{\gamma}_0 - 2(1+Z)(\partial_y + \frac{Z}{y})\tilde{\alpha}_0 \end{array}\right. . \tag{4.57}$$

The singularity at the origin is treated using the vanishing of $\mathbf{w}$ at the origin and the estimates of Appendix B. We focus on the estimates for $y\geq 1$ for which we rewrite using the equation $HT_1 = \Lambda\phi$:

$$\begin{array}{rl} \mathbf{f}_2 = \mathbf{w}\wedge \quad O & \left(|U(t)|\dfrac{1}{y}\mathbf{1}_{y\leq 2B_1} + \dfrac{b}{y}\mathbf{1}_{y\geq B_1} + b\dfrac{|\mathrm{log} y|\mathbf{1}_{B_1\leq y\leq 2B_1}}{y} + b^2y\mathbf{1}_{y\leq 2B_1}\right. \\ & \left. + \dfrac{b}{|\mathrm{log} b|}\dfrac{|\mathrm{log} y|}{1+y^2}\mathbf{1}_{y\leq 2B_1}\right) \end{array} \tag{4.58}$$

from which

$$\begin{array}{rl} & \displaystyle\int\frac{|\mathbf{f}_2^{\perp}|^2}{1+y^8} + \int\frac{1+|\mathrm{log} y|^2}{1+y^4}|R_z\mathbb{H}\mathbf{f}_2^{\perp}|^2 + \int\frac{1+|\mathrm{log} y|^2}{1+y^2}|\mathbb{A}R_z\mathbb{H}\mathbf{f}_2^{\perp}|^2 + \int|(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H})^2\mathbf{f}_2|^2 \\ \lesssim & \dfrac{C(M)b^2}{|\mathrm{log} b|^2}\left(\dfrac{b^4}{|\mathrm{log} b|^2} + \mathcal{E}_4\right) \lesssim b^2\left(\dfrac{b^4}{|\mathrm{log} b|^2} + \delta(b^*)\mathcal{E}_4\right). \end{array}$$

This concludes the proof of (4.53), (4.54).
This concludes the proof of Proposition 4.6.

5. **Closing the Bootstrap**

We are now in position to close the bootstrap and complete the proof of Proposition 4.2.

5.1. **Energy estimates.** In this section, we close the three Sobolev bounds of Proposition 4.2.

step 1 Energy bound.

The Dirichlet energy $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla v|^2$ for a map

$$v = \hat{\alpha} e_r + \hat{\beta} e_\tau + (1+\hat{\gamma})Q$$

is given by the expression

$$\begin{aligned} E(v) &= (H\hat{\alpha},\hat{\alpha}) + (H\hat{\beta},\hat{\beta}) + (-\Delta\hat{\gamma},\hat{\gamma}) + 2\int (1+Z)\left(\hat{\gamma}\partial_r\hat{\alpha} - \hat{\alpha}\partial_r\hat{\gamma} + \frac{Z}{r}\hat{\alpha}\hat{\gamma}\right) \\ &+ \int (1+Z)^2, \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

where

$$E(Q) = \int (1+Z)^2.$$

We now linearize this expression by letting

$$\hat{\alpha} = \tilde{\alpha}_0 + \alpha, \quad \hat{\beta} = \tilde{\beta}_0 + \beta, \quad \hat{\gamma} = \tilde{\gamma}_0 + \gamma.$$

We have by construction of the profile:

$$\|\partial_y \widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0}{y}\|_{L^2}^2 + |E(\tilde{\alpha}_0 e_r + \tilde{\beta}_0 e_\tau + (1+\tilde{\gamma}_0)Q) - E(Q)| \lesssim \sqrt{b} \tag{5.2}$$

and thus from the initial smallness assumption (4.9):

$$|E(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}(0)) - E(Q)| \lesssim \delta(b^*).$$

Moreover, the choice of orthogonality conditions (4.6) ensures the coercivity estimate:

$$(H\alpha,\alpha) + (H\beta,\beta) \geq C(M)\left[\|\partial_y \mathbf{w}^\perp\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\frac{\mathbf{w}^\perp}{y}\|_{L^2}^2\right] \tag{5.3}$$

see Appendix A. Returning to (5.1), the relation

$$2\hat{\gamma} = -\hat{\gamma}^2 - \hat{\alpha}^2 - \hat{\beta}^2,$$

implies that $\hat{\gamma}$ is a quadratic quantity which, together with the bootstrap bounds, allows us to estimate the cross terms. Injecting (5.2), (5.3) into (5.1) now yields (4.17).

step 2 Closing the $\mathcal{E}_4$ bound.

We integrate the differential inequality (4.33) and use the bootstrap bound (4.15). This yields: $\forall t \in [0,t_1)$,

$$\mathcal{E}_4(t) \leq \left(\frac{\lambda(t)}{\lambda(0)}\right)^6 \mathcal{E}_4(0) + (2(1-d_1)K + C)\lambda^6(t)\int_0^t \frac{b}{\lambda^8}\frac{b^4}{|\log b|^2}d\sigma \tag{5.4}$$

for some universal constants $0 < d_1 < 1$, $C > 0$ independent of M. Let C_1, C_2 be two large enough universal constants and define

$$\alpha_1 = 2 - \frac{C_1}{\sqrt{\log M}}, \quad \alpha_2 = 2 + \frac{C_2}{\sqrt{\log M}} \tag{5.5}$$

Observe that

$$b(t) > 0$$

from (4.12) and (4.14) since $b(t_0) = 0$ would imply that $u(t_0)$ is a rescaling of Q which, by uniqueness, contradicts the initial data assumption. We observe from the modulation equations (4.27), (4.28) and the bootstrap assumption (4.15) that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{ds}\left\{\frac{|\log b|^{\alpha_i} b}{\lambda}\right\} &= \frac{|\log b|^{\alpha_i}}{\lambda}\left[\left(1 - \frac{\alpha_i}{|\log b|}\right) b_s + b^2 - b\left(\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda} + b\right)\right] \\
&= \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_i}{|\log b|}\right)\frac{|\log b|^{\alpha_i}}{\lambda}\left[b_s + b^2\left(1 + \frac{\alpha_i}{|\log b|} + O\left(\frac{1}{|\log b|^2}\right)\right)\right] \\
& \left\{\begin{array}{ll} \leq 0 & \text{for } \ i = 1 \\ \geq 0 & \text{for } \ i = 2. \end{array}\right.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the last inequality requires the choice of $C_1, C_2 \gg \sqrt{K}$. Integrating this from 0 to t yields:

$$\frac{b(0)}{\lambda(0)}\left(\frac{|\log b(0||}{|\log b(t)|}\right)^{\alpha_2} \leq \frac{b(t)}{\lambda(t)} \leq \frac{b(0)}{\lambda(0)}\left(\frac{|\log b(0||}{|\log b(t)|}\right)^{\alpha_1}. \tag{5.6}$$

This yields in particular using the initial bound (4.10):

$$\left(\frac{\lambda(t)}{\lambda(0)}\right)^6 \mathcal{E}_4(0) \leq (b(t)|\log b(t)|^{\alpha_2})^6 \frac{\mathcal{E}_0}{(b(0)|\log b(0)|^{\alpha_2})^6} \leq \frac{b^4(t)}{|\log b(t)|^2}. \tag{5.7}$$

We now compute explicitely using $b = -\lambda\lambda_t + O\left(\frac{b^2}{|\log b|}\right)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^t \frac{b}{\lambda^8}\frac{b^4}{|\log b|^2} d\tau &= \frac{1}{6}\left[\frac{b^4}{\lambda^6|\log b|^2}\right]_0^t - \frac{1}{6}\int_0^t \frac{b_t b^3}{\lambda^6|\log b|^2}\left(4 + \frac{2}{|\log b|}\right) d\tau \\
&+ O\left(\int_0^t \frac{b}{\lambda^8}\frac{b^6}{|\log b|^2} d\tau\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Using the monotonicity bound $\lambda^2 b_t = b_s \leq -b^2$ from (4.28) we obtain:

$$\lambda^6(t)\int_0^t \frac{b}{\lambda^8}\frac{b^4}{|\log b|^2} d\sigma \leq \frac{1}{2}\left[1 + O\left(\frac{1}{|\log b_0|}\right)\right]\frac{b^4(t)}{|\log b(t)|^2}.$$

Combiningthis together with (5.7) and inserting into (5.4) yields

$$\mathcal{E}_4(t) \leq ((1 - d_2)K + C)\frac{b^4(t)}{|\log b(t)|^2}$$

for some universal constants $0 < d_2 < 1$ and $C > 0$ independent of M. The desired bound (4.19) follows for K large enough independent of M.

step 3 Closing the $\mathcal{E}_2$ bound.

Observe that interpolating between the $\mathcal{E}_1$ and the $\mathcal{E}_4$ bounds does not give enough decay in b and we need a dynamical argument. Let us come back to the original map u and compute from (1.1), (2.16):

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\left\{\int|u\wedge\Delta u|^2\right\} &= \int u\wedge\Delta u\cdot[(u\wedge\Delta u)\wedge\Delta u+u\wedge\Delta(u\wedge\Delta u)] \quad (5.8)\\ &= \int u\wedge\Delta u\cdot[u\wedge\Delta(u\wedge\Delta u)]\\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda^4}\int v\wedge\Delta v\cdot[v\wedge\Delta(v\wedge\Delta v)]\end{aligned}$$

We now recall that for any vector a with radial coordinates in the Frenet basis

$$a=\alpha e_r+\beta e_\tau+\gamma Q, \quad \Gamma=\left|\begin{array}{l}\alpha\\ \beta\\ \gamma\end{array}\right. ,$$

there holds

$$a\cdot[u\wedge\Delta a]=a\cdot\left[u\wedge(\Delta a+|\nabla Q|^2a)\right]=-\Gamma\cdot[(e_z+\widehat{\mathbf{w}})\wedge\mathbb{H}\Gamma]=-\Gamma\cdot\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\Gamma. \quad (5.9)$$

We use the decomposition

$$v=e_z+\widehat{\mathbf{w}}$$

in terms of coordinates in the Frenet basis, and apply (5.9) with

$$a=v\wedge\Delta v=v\wedge(\Delta v+|\nabla Q|^2v) \ \text{ so that } \ \Gamma=-\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\widehat{\mathbf{w}}$$

to conclude from (5.8):

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\left\{\frac{1}{\lambda^2}\int|\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\widehat{\mathbf{w}}|^2\right\}=-\frac{1}{\lambda^4}\int\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\widehat{\mathbf{w}}\cdot\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\widehat{\mathbf{w}}).$$

We now split $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}=\mathbf{w}+\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0$ and obtain equivalently:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\left\{\frac{1}{\lambda^2}\int|\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\widehat{\mathbf{w}}|^2\right\} &= -\frac{1}{\lambda^4}\left[\int\mathbf{w}_2\cdot\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}_2+\int\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0\cdot\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0)\right.\\ &+ \left.\int\mathbf{w}_2\cdot\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0)+\int\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0\cdot\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}_2\right].\end{aligned}$$

We then estimate from Cauchy Schwarz, Lemma 4.7, (6.71), (6.82), (6.85):

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\left\{\frac{1}{\lambda^2}\int|\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\widehat{\mathbf{w}}|^2\right\}\\ \lesssim\ & \frac{1}{\lambda^4}\left[\|\mathbf{w}_2\|_{L^2}\|\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}_2\|_{L^2}+b\|\mathbb{H}\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0\|^2_{L^2}+\|\mathbb{H}\widehat{J}\mathbf{w}_2\|_{L^2}\|\mathbb{H}\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0\|_{L^2}+\|\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}_2\|_{L^2}\|\mathbb{H}\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0\|_{L^2}\right]\\ \lesssim\ & \frac{1}{\lambda^4}\left[\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_2}\frac{b^2}{|\log b|^2}+b^3|\log b|^2+\left(\frac{b^4}{|\log b|^2}b^2|\log b|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right]\\ \lesssim\ & \frac{1}{\lambda^4}\left[\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_2}\frac{b^2}{|\log b|^2}+b^3|\log b|^2\right]\lesssim\frac{b^3|\log b|^2}{\lambda^4}\end{aligned}$$

where we used the boostrap bound (4.14) in the last step. We integrate this in time using (6.77) and the initial bound (4.14) to derive:

$$\mathcal{E}_2(t)\lesssim b^2(t)|\log b(t)|^2+\lambda^2(t)b_0^{10}+\lambda^2(t)\int_0^t\frac{b^3}{\lambda^4}d\tau.$$

We then estimate using (5.6) and $b^2\lesssim -b_s$:

$$\int_0^t\frac{b^3}{\lambda^4}\lesssim\frac{b^2(0)|\log b(0)|^{2\alpha_1}}{\lambda^2(0)}\int_0^t-\frac{b_t}{b|\log b|^{2\alpha_1}}\lesssim\frac{b^2(0)|\log b(0)|}{\lambda^2(0)}$$

where we used $\alpha_1 - 1 > 0$ for M large enough from (5.5). Hence from (5.6):

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_2(t) &\lesssim b^2(t)|\log b(t)|^2 + \lambda^2(t)b_0^{10} + \lambda^2(t)\frac{b^2(0)|\log b(0)|}{\lambda^2(0)} \\ &\lesssim b^2(t)|\log b(t)|^2 + b^2(0)|\log b(0)|\frac{b^2(t)}{b^2(0)|\log b(0)|^{2\alpha_2}}|\log b(t)|^{2\alpha_2} \\ &\lesssim b^2|\log b(t)|^5\end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

and (4.18) is proved.

5.2. **Modulation parameters** a, b. In this section we prove (4.16). The bound $b(t) \leq \frac{K}{2}b^*(M)$ follows immediately from the monotonicity $b_s \leq 0$. The estimate

$$|a(t)| \leq \frac{b(t)}{2|\log b(t)|}$$

will be shown to hold for a special choice of the data $a(0)$, which depends on the data $\mathbf{w}(0)$ and $b(0)$. This restriction is consistent with the statement of our main result.

Indeed, let us show that for a given parameter $b(0)$ and the data $\mathbf{w}(0)$ satisfying the assumptions (4.8), (4.9), (4.10) we can find a value of the parameter $a(0)$ with the property that $|a(0)| \leq \frac{b(0)}{4|\log b(0)|}$ and such that the bound (4.16)

$$\forall t \in [0, t_1), \quad |a(t)| \leq \frac{b(t)}{2|\log b(t)|}$$

holds along the dynamics generated by the data $(a(0), b(0), w(0))$. Define

$$\kappa(s) = a(s)\frac{|\log b(s)|}{2b(s)}.$$

Considering the data $a(0)$ in the interval $\mathcal{I} = [-\frac{b(0)}{4|\log b(0)|}, \frac{b(0)}{4|\log b(0)|})]$ ensures that $\kappa(0) \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$ and provides the existence of $s_* = s_*(a(0)) \in (0, +\infty]$ such that $|\kappa(s)| < 1$ for all $0 \leq s < s_*$ and $|\kappa(s_*)| = 1$, if $s_* < +\infty$. Note that if $s_*(a_0) = +\infty$ then the corresponding value of $a(0)$ produces the desired conclusion.

Given the bound $|\kappa(s)| < 1$ all the conclusions of Theorem 4.2 as well as Lemma 4.4 hold on the interval $[0, t_*(s_*))$. We then compute with the help of the modulation equations of Lemma 4.4:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{ds}\kappa(s) &= a_s\frac{|\log b|}{2b} - a\frac{b_s}{2b^2} - a\frac{|\log b|}{2b^2}b_s = -a + \frac{a}{2}(1 + |\log b|) + a + O\left(\frac{|a| + |b|}{\sqrt{\log M}}\right) \\ &= b\kappa(1 + o(1)) + O\left(\frac{b}{\sqrt{\log M}}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

This equation and positivity of $b(s)$ implies that $\kappa(s)$ is monotonically decreasing if $\kappa(0) \leq -\frac{C}{\sqrt{\log M}}$ and monotonically increasing if $\kappa(0) \geq \frac{C}{\sqrt{\log M}}$ for some universal constant C. We now define two subintervals $\mathcal{I}_+$ and $\mathcal{I}_-$ of $\mathcal{I} = [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$ with the property that for $\kappa(0) \in \mathcal{I}_\pm$ there exists a finite value s_* such that $|\kappa(s)| < 1$ for all $0 \leq s < s_*$ and $\kappa(s_*) = \pm 1$.

If $\mathcal{I}_+$ is empty[3] then any $\kappa(0) \geq \frac{C}{\sqrt{\log M}}$ yields the claim, similarily for $\mathcal{I}_-$. We therefore assume that both $\mathcal{I}_\pm$ are non empty. Then the nondegeneracy (5.11) ensures that $\pm\frac{d}{ds}\kappa(s^*) > 0$ for in $\mathcal{I}_\pm$, and thus $\mathcal{I}_\pm$ are open non empty disjoint subsets $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$. As a consequence, there exists at least one value of $\kappa(0) \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$

---

[3] Note that we can easily show in fact that $\pm\frac{1}{2} \in \mathcal{I}_\pm$

such that $\kappa(0) \notin (\mathcal{I}_+ \cup \mathcal{I}_-)$. For this value of $\kappa(0)$ we have $|\kappa(s)| < 1$ for all $0 \leq s < \infty$, as desired.

6. Sharp description of the singularity formation

We are now in position to conclude the proof of Theorem 1.1.

6.1. **Finite time blow up.** Let $T \leq +\infty$ be the life span of u, then the estimates of Proposition 4.2 hold on $[0, T)$. From (5.6),

$$-\frac{d}{dt}\sqrt{\lambda} = -\frac{1}{2\lambda\sqrt{\lambda}}\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda} \gtrsim \frac{b}{\lambda\sqrt{\lambda}} \gtrsim C(u_0) > 0$$

and thus $\lambda(t)$ becomes equal to zero in finite time which implies

$$T < +\infty.$$

Observe then from (5.6) that this implies

$$\lambda(T) = b(T) = 0. \tag{6.1}$$

Integrating the modulation equation (4.28) from $s = \infty$ we obtain

$$b(s) = \frac{1}{s} + O(\frac{1}{s\mathrm{log}s}). \tag{6.2}$$

6.2. **Asymptotics.** We now prove convergence of the phase $\Theta(t)$ as $t \to T$, give the sharp description of the blow up speed and prove convergence of the energy excess.

step 1 Refined bound for a.

The bound (4.16) is not sufficient to prove the convergence of the phase Θ since

$$\int_0^s \frac{b}{|\mathrm{log}b|} \sim |\mathrm{log}b(s)| \to +\infty \quad \text{as} \quad s \to +\infty.$$

We claim however that the global $\mathcal{E}_4$ bound now allows for an additional logarithmic gain:

$$|a(t)| \lesssim C(\delta_0)\frac{b(t)}{|\mathrm{log}b(t)|^{\frac{3}{2}}}. \tag{6.3}$$

for some small enough universal constant $\delta_0 > 0$ and a large constant $C(\delta_0)$. This, together with (4.27), implies tzhat

$$|\Theta_s| \lesssim C(\delta_0)\frac{b(s)}{|\mathrm{log}b(s)|^{\frac{3}{2}}}$$

and, after application of the bound (6.2), leads to the convergence of the phase Θ:

$$\Theta(t) \to \Theta(T) \in \mathbb{R} \quad \text{as} \quad t \to T. \tag{6.4}$$

To show (6.3), let

$$B_\delta = \frac{1}{b^\delta}$$

for some sufficiently small $\delta > 0$. We project (4.22) onto the first component α, commute the equation with H and take the inner product with $\chi_{B_\delta}\Lambda\phi$. As in the proof of (4.30) we obtain:

$$(H\tilde{T}_1, \chi_{B_\delta}\Lambda\phi) = 4\mathrm{log}B_\delta\left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{|\mathrm{log}b|}\right)\right).$$

As in the proof of (3.14) we estimate from (3.61):

$$-(H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(1)},\chi_{B_\delta}\Lambda\phi)=O\left(\frac{b^2}{|\log b|^2}\log B_\delta\right). \tag{6.5}$$

Moreover,

$$|(H^2\alpha,\chi_{B_\delta}\Lambda\phi)|\lesssim\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_4}\left(\int_{y\le B_\delta}|\Lambda\phi|^2\right)^{\frac12}\lesssim\frac{b^2}{\sqrt{|\log b|}}.$$

All other nonlinear terms are easily estimated using the $\mathcal{E}_4$ bound and the smallness of $\delta>0$, leading to the bound:

$$\begin{aligned} a_s &= -\frac{1}{(H\tilde{T}_1,\chi_{B_\delta}\Lambda\phi)}(\partial_s H\alpha,\chi_{B_\delta}\Lambda\phi)+O\left(C(\delta)\frac{b^2}{|\log b|^{\frac32}}\right)+O\left(bb^{-C\delta}\frac{b^2}{|\log b|}\right)\\ &= -\frac{d}{ds}\left\{\frac{1}{(H\tilde{T}_1,\chi_{B_\delta}\Lambda\phi)}(H\alpha,\chi_{B_\delta}\Lambda\phi)\right\}+O\left(C(\delta)\frac{b^2}{|\log b|^{\frac32}}\right)+O\left(b^{-C\delta}\frac{b^3}{|\log b|}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\tilde{a}=a+\frac{1}{(H\tilde{T}_1,\chi_{B_\delta}\Lambda\phi)}(H\alpha,\chi_{B_\delta}\Lambda\phi)=a+O\left(b^{-C\delta}\frac{b^2}{|\log b|^2}\right),$$

and thus:

$$\tilde{a}_s=O\left(\frac{b^2}{|\log b|^{\frac32}}\right).$$

We now integrate this identity in time using (6.2) to and the convergence $\tilde{a}\to 0$ for $s\to\infty$ from (6.2), (6.3) to conclude:

$$|\tilde{a}|\lesssim\frac{b}{|\log b|^{\frac32}},$$

and (6.3) is proved.

step 2 Derivation of the blow up speed.

Arguing as for a we now slightly refine our control for b. We project (4.22) onto the second component β, commute with H and take the inner product with $\chi_{B_\delta}\Lambda\phi$. We use

$$-(H\tilde{\Psi}_0^{(2)},\chi_{B_\delta}\Lambda\phi)=4c_b b^2\log B_\delta\left(1+O\left(\frac{1}{\log B_\delta}\right)\right)$$

to get:

$$\begin{aligned} & b_s+b^2\left(1+\frac{2}{|\log b|}\right)\\ = & -\frac{1}{(H\tilde{T}_1,\chi_{B_\delta}\Lambda\phi)}(\partial_s H\beta,\chi_{B_\delta}\Lambda\phi)+O\left(C(\delta)\frac{b^2}{|\log b|^{\frac32}}\right)+O\left(b^{-C\delta}\frac{b^3}{|\log b|}\right)\\ = & -\frac{d}{ds}\left\{\frac{1}{(H\tilde{T}_1,\chi_{B_\delta}\Lambda\phi)}(H\beta,\chi_{B_\delta}\Lambda\phi)\right\}+O\left(C(\delta)\frac{b^2}{|\log b|^{\frac32}}\right)+O\left(b^{-C\delta}\frac{b^3}{|\log b|}\right). \end{aligned}$$

We now let

$$\tilde{b}=b+\frac{1}{(H\tilde{T}_1,\chi_{B_\delta}\Lambda\phi)}(H\beta,\chi_{B_\delta}\Lambda\phi)=b+O\left(\frac{b^2}{|\log b|^2}b^{-C\delta}\right) \tag{6.6}$$

and obtain the pointwise refined control:

$$\left|\tilde{b}_s+\tilde{b}^2\left(1+\frac{2}{|\mathrm{log}\tilde{b}|}\right)\right|\lesssim\frac{\tilde{b}^2}{|\mathrm{log}\tilde{b}|^{\frac{3}{2}}}.$$

Equivalently,

$$\frac{\tilde{b}_s}{\tilde{b}^2\left(1+\frac{2}{|\mathrm{log}\tilde{b}|}\right)}+1=O\left(\frac{1}{|\mathrm{log}\tilde{b}|^{\frac{3}{2}}}\right).$$

We now integrate this in time using $\lim_{s\to+\infty}\tilde{b}(s)=0$ from (6.1) and get:

$$\tilde{b}(s)=\frac{1}{s}-\frac{2}{s\mathrm{log}s}+O\left(\frac{1}{s|\mathrm{log}s|^{\frac{3}{2}}}\right)$$

and thus from (6.6):

$$b(s)=\frac{1}{s}-\frac{2}{s\mathrm{log}s}+O\left(\frac{1}{s|\mathrm{log}s|^{\frac{3}{2}}}\right). \tag{6.7}$$

We now use the modulation equation (4.27) to conclude:

$$-\frac{\lambda_s}{\lambda}=\frac{1}{s}-\frac{2}{s\mathrm{log}s}+O\left(\frac{1}{s|\mathrm{log}s|^{\frac{3}{2}}}\right). \tag{6.8}$$

We rewrite this as

$$\left|\frac{d}{ds}\mathrm{log}\left(\frac{s\lambda(s)}{(\mathrm{log}s)^2}\right)\right|\lesssim\frac{1}{s|\mathrm{log}s|^{\frac{3}{2}}}$$

and thus integrating in time yields the existence of a constant $\kappa(u_0)>0$, dependent on the data u_0, such that:

$$\mathrm{log}\frac{s\lambda(s)}{(\mathrm{log}s)^2}=\frac{1}{\kappa(u_0)}\left[1+O\left(\frac{1}{|\mathrm{log}s|^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right)\right].$$

Therefore,

$$-\mathrm{log}\lambda=\mathrm{log}s\left[1-2\frac{\mathrm{loglog}s}{\mathrm{log}s}+\frac{1}{\kappa(u_0)}O\left(\frac{1}{|\mathrm{log}s|^{\frac{3}{2}}}\right)\right]$$

and hence

$$\frac{1}{s}=\kappa'(u_0)\frac{\lambda}{|\mathrm{log}\lambda|^2}\left(1+o(1)\right)$$

for some constant $\kappa'(u_0)$. The identity (6.7) now implies

$$b=\kappa'(u_0)\frac{\lambda}{|\mathrm{log}\lambda|^2}\left(1+o(1)\right),$$

which in turn means that

$$-\lambda\lambda_t=\kappa'(u_0)\frac{\lambda}{|\mathrm{log}\lambda|^2}\left(1+o(1)\right)$$

and thus

$$-|\mathrm{log}\lambda|^2\lambda_t=\kappa'(u_0)(1+o(1)).$$

Integrating from t to T with $\lambda(T)=0$ yields

$$\lambda(t)=\kappa'(u_0)\frac{T-t}{|\mathrm{log}(T-t)|^2}\left[1+o(1)\right].$$

Observe in particular the control

$$\frac{b}{\lambda} = \frac{k'(u_0)}{|\log(T-t)|^2}(1+o(1)). \tag{6.9}$$

step 3 Strong convergence of the excess of energy.

We now turn to the proof of (1.8). We recall the decomposition:

$$u(t,x) = e^{\Theta(t)R}(Q+\widehat{\mathbf{w}})_\lambda = e^{\Theta(t)R}(Q)_\lambda + \tilde{u}.$$

The H^1 bound

$$\|\nabla \tilde{u}\|_{L^2} \lesssim 1$$

is a simple consequence of the orbital stability bound and the energy critical scaling invariance. We now claim the $\dot{H}^2$ bound:

$$\|\Delta \tilde{u}\|_{L^2} \lesssim 1. \tag{6.10}$$

Assume (6.77), then a simple localization argument using (1.1) and the bound (6.10) yields the strong convergence outside the blow up point:

$$\forall R>0, \ \ \nabla u \to \nabla u^* \ \text{ as } \ t\to T \ \text{ in } \ L^2(|x|\geq R)$$

or equivalently:

$$\forall R>0, \ \ \nabla \tilde{u} \to \nabla u^* \ \text{ as } \ t\to T \ \text{ in } \ L^2(|x|\geq R) \tag{6.11}$$

for some equivariant map $\nabla u^* \in L^2$. The convergence (1.8) now follows from

$$E(u_0) = E(Q) + E(u^*)$$

which is the consequence of the conservation of energy, the outer convergence (6.11) and the local compactness of Sobolev embedding through the $\dot{H}^2$ bound (6.10). The convergence (1.8) and the bound (6.10) now yield the regularity (1.11).
Proof of 6.10: Let us recall by definition that

$$\tilde{u} = \mathcal{S}\widehat{\mathbf{w}}$$

and thus from (2.19) and the decay $|\nabla Q| \lesssim 1+Z$:

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda^2\int|\Delta\tilde{u}|^2 &\lesssim \int\frac{|\widehat{\mathbf{w}}|^2}{1+y^8} + \int|\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\widehat{\mathbf{w}}|^2\\ &\lesssim \mathcal{E}_2 + b^2|\log b|^2\end{aligned}$$

where we used (6.60), (6.43), (6.77) and (6.71). We now recall (5.10) which together with (6.9) yields:

$$\mathcal{E}_2 + b^2|\log b|^2 \lesssim \lambda^2$$

and (6.10) follows.
This concludes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Appendix A: L^2 coercivity estimates

This Appendix is devoted to the derivation of L^2 weighted coercivity estimates for the operator H and its iterate H^2, which generalize related results in [37], [33].

6.3. **Hardy inequalities.**

Lemma 6.1 (Logarithmic Hardy inequalities)**.** *$\forall R>2$, $\forall v\in \dot{H}^1_{rad}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ and $\gamma>0$, there holds the following controls:*

$$\int_{y\leq R}\frac{|v|^2}{y^2(1+|\log y|)^2}\lesssim\int_{1\leq y\leq 2}|v|^2+\int_{y\leq R}|\nabla v|^2, \tag{6.12}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\gamma^2}{4}\int_{1\leq y\leq R}\frac{|v|^2}{y^{2+\gamma}(1+|\log y|)^2}\\ \leq\ & C_\gamma\int_{1\leq y\leq 2}|v|^2+\int_{1\leq y\leq R}\frac{|\nabla v|^2}{y^\gamma(1+|\log y|)^2},\end{aligned} \tag{6.13}$$

$$|v|^2_{L^\infty(1\leq y\leq R)}\lesssim\int_{1\leq y\leq 2}|v|^2+R^2\int_{1\leq y\leq R}\frac{|\nabla v|^2}{y^2}, \tag{6.14}$$

$$\int_{y\leq R}|v|^2\lesssim R^2\left(\int_{y\leq 2}|v|^2+\log R\int_{y\leq R}|\nabla v|^2\right), \tag{6.15}$$

$$\int_{R\leq y\leq 2R}\frac{|v|^2}{y^2}\lesssim\int_{y\leq 2}|v|^2+\log R\int_{y\leq 2R}|\nabla v|^2. \tag{6.16}$$

If $\int_{y\leq 1}\frac{|v|^2}{y^2}<+\infty$, then:

$$\int_{y\leq 2R}\frac{|v|^2}{y^2}\lesssim\log R\int_{y\leq 2}|v|^2+(\log R)^2\int_{y\leq 2R}|\nabla v|^2. \tag{6.17}$$

Proof. Let v smooth and radially symmetric. First recall from the one dimensional Sobolev embedding $H^1(1\leq y\leq 2)\hookrightarrow L^\infty(1\leq y\leq 2)$ that

$$|v(1)|^2\lesssim\int_{1\leq y\leq 2}(|v|^2+|\partial_y v|^2).$$

Let $f(y)=-\frac{\mathbf{e}_y}{y(1+|\log y|)}$ so that

$$\nabla\cdot f=\left|\begin{array}{ll}\frac{1}{y^2(1+|\log y|)^2} & \text{for }\ y\geq 1\\ -\frac{1}{y^2(1+|\log y|)^2} & \text{for }\ y\leq 1\end{array}\right.$$

and integrate by parts to get:

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\varepsilon\leq y\leq R}\frac{|v|^2}{y^2(1+|\log y|)^2}=-\int_{\varepsilon\leq y\leq 1}|v|^2\nabla\cdot f+\int_{1\leq y\leq R}|v|^2\nabla\cdot f\\ \lesssim\ & -\left[\frac{|v|^2}{1+|\log(y)|}\right]_1^R+\left[\frac{|v|^2}{1+|\log(y)|}\right]_\varepsilon^1+\int_{y\leq R}\left|v\partial_y v\frac{1}{y(1+|\log y|)}\right|\\ \lesssim\ & |v(1)|^2+\left(\int_{\varepsilon\leq y\leq R}\frac{|v|^2}{y^2(1+|\log y|)^2}\right)^{\frac12}\left(\int_{\varepsilon\leq y\leq R}|\nabla v|^2\right)^{\frac12},\end{aligned}$$

and (6.12) follows. To prove (6.13), let $\gamma>0$ and

$$f(y)=-\frac{\mathbf{e}_y}{y^{\gamma+1}(1+\log y)^2}$$

so that for $y\geq 1$:

$$\nabla\cdot f=\frac{1}{y^{\gamma+2}(1+\log y)^2}\left[\gamma+\frac{2}{(1+\log y)^3}\right]\geq\frac{\gamma}{y^{\gamma+2}(1+\log y)^2}.$$

We then integrate by parts to get:

$$\gamma\int_{1\leq y\leq R}\frac{|v|^2}{y^{\gamma+2}(1+\mathrm{log}y)^2}\leq\int_{1\leq y\leq R}|v|^2\nabla\cdot f$$
$$\leq -\left[\frac{|v|^2}{y^{\gamma}(1+\log(y))^2}\right]_1^R+2\int_{1\leq y\leq R}\frac{|v\partial_y v|}{y^{\gamma+1}(1+\mathrm{log}y)^2}$$
$$\leq C\int_{1\leq y\leq 2}|v|^2+2\left(\int_{1\leq y\leq R}\frac{|v|^2}{y^{\gamma+2}(1+\mathrm{log}y)^2}\right)^{\frac12}\left(\int_{1\leq y\leq R}\frac{|\nabla v|^2}{y^{\gamma}(1+\mathrm{log}y)^2}\right)^{\frac12}$$

and (6.13) follows. To prove (6.14), we have: $\forall y\in[1,R]$,

$$|v(y)|=\left|v(1)+\int_1^y v'(r)dr\right|\lesssim|v(1)|+R\left(\int_{1\leq y\leq R}\frac{|\nabla v|^2}{y^2}\right)^{\frac12},$$

and (6.14) follows. Similarily,

$$|v(y)|=\left|v(1)+\int_1^y v'(r)dr\right|\lesssim|v(1)|+\left(\int_{y\leq R}|\nabla v|^2\right)^{\frac12}\sqrt{\mathrm{log}R},$$

and (6.15), (6.16) follow by squaring this estimate and integrating in R. Finally, (6.17) follows from (6.16) by summing over dyadic R-intervals. ☐

6.4. **Sub-coercivity estimates.** In this section we establish weighted sub-coercive estimates for the operators H and H^2 which will play a key role in the proof of the coercive estimates under additional orthogonality conditions.

Lemma 6.2 (Sub-coercivity for H). *Let u be a function with the property*

$$\int\frac{|u|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}+\int|\partial_y(Au)|^2+\int\frac{|Au|^2}{y^2(1+y^2)}<+\infty \tag{6.18}$$

then

$$\int(Hu)^2\approx\int\frac{|Au|^2}{y^2(1+y^2)}+\int|\partial_y(Au)|^2 \tag{6.19}$$
$$\gtrsim \int\frac{|\partial_y^2u|^2}{(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}+\int\frac{|\partial_y u|^2}{y^2(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}+\int\frac{|u|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}$$
$$- C\int\frac{|u|^2}{1+y^5}. \tag{6.20}$$

Proof of (6.19): First observe from (2.12) that:

$$\int(Hu)^2=\int(A^*Au)^2=(Au,\tilde{H}(Au))\approx\int|\partial_yAu|^2+\int\frac{|Au|^2}{y^2(1+y^2)}.$$

Let now a smooth cut off function $\chi(y)=1$ for $y\leq1$, $\chi(y)=0$ for $y\geq2$, and consider the decomposition:

$$u=u_1+u_2=\chi u+(1-\chi)u.$$

Then from (6.12):

$$\int\frac{|Au|^2}{y^2(1+y^2)}+\int|\partial_y(Au)|^2\gtrsim\left[\int\frac{|Au|^2}{y^2(1+y^2)}+\frac{|Au|^2}{y^2(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}\right]. \tag{6.21}$$

For the first term, we rewrite:

$$\begin{aligned}\int \frac{|Au|^2}{y^2(1+y^2)} &\geq \int \frac{|Au_1|^2}{y^2}+2\int \frac{(Au_1)(Au_2)}{y^2(1+y^2)}\\ &\gtrsim \left[\int \frac{|y\partial_y\left(\frac{u_1}{y}\right)|^2}{y^2}-\int \frac{|Z-1|^2}{y^2}|u_1|^2-C\int_{1\leq y\leq 2}|u|^2\right]\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we integrated by parts the quantity:

$(Au_1)(Au_2)=(\chi Au-\chi' u)((1-\chi)Au+\chi' u)\geq \chi(Au)\chi' u-\chi' u(1-\chi)(Au)-(\chi')^2u^2$.

We hence conclude from $|Z(y)-1|\lesssim y$ for $y\leq 1$ and the Hardy inequality (6.12) applied to $\frac{u_1}{y}\in H^1_{rad}$ fom (6.18) that:

$$\int \frac{|Au|^2}{y^2(1+y^2)}\gtrsim \left[\int \frac{|u_1|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}-C\int_{y\leq 2}|u|^2\right]. \tag{6.22}$$

Similarily we estimate:

$$\begin{aligned}&\int \frac{|Au|^2}{y^2(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}\geq \int \frac{|Au_2|^2}{y^2(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}+2\int \frac{(Au_1)(Au_2)}{y^2(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}\\ \gtrsim\ &\left[\int \frac{1}{y^2(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}|\partial_y u_2+\frac{u_2}{y}|^2-C\int \frac{|1+Z|^2}{y^2(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}|u_2|^2-C\int_{1\leq y\leq 2}|u|^2\right]\\ \gtrsim\ &\left[\int \frac{|\partial_y u_2|^2}{y^2(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}+\int \frac{|u_2|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}-C\int \frac{|u_2|^2}{y^6(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}\right]\end{aligned} \tag{6.23}$$

where we applied the weighted Hardy (6.13) to yu_2 with $\gamma=4$ and integrated by parts for the last step using the bound $|1+Z(y)|\lesssim\frac{1}{y^2}$ for $y\geq 1$. (6.21), (6.22) and (6.23) imply:

$$\int \frac{|Au|^2}{y^2(1+y^2)}+\int |\partial_y(Au)|^2\gtrsim \left[\int \frac{|u|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}-C\int \frac{|u|^2}{1+y^5}\right]. \tag{6.24}$$

This implies using again (6.12):

$$\begin{aligned}\int \frac{|\partial_y u|^2}{y^2(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2} &\lesssim \int \frac{|Au|^2}{y^2(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}+\int \frac{|u|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}\\ &\lesssim \int |\partial_y(Au)|^2+\int \frac{|Au|^2}{y^2(1+y^2)}+\int \frac{|u|^2}{1+y^5}.\end{aligned} \tag{6.25}$$

Finally, examining the expression

$$\partial_y(Au)=\partial_y(-\partial_y u+\frac{Z}{y}u)$$

we also obtain

$$\int \frac{|\partial_y^2 u|^2}{(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}\lesssim \int |\partial_y(Au)|^2+\int \frac{|Au|^2}{y^2(1+y^2)}+\int \frac{|u|^2}{1+y^5}$$

which together with (6.24), (6.25) concludes the proof of (6.19) and of Lemma 6.2.

Lemma 6.3 (Weighted sub-coercivity for H)**.** *Let u be a function with the property*

$$\begin{aligned}&\int \frac{|Hu|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}+\int \frac{|\partial_y Hu|^2}{y^2(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}\\ +\ &\int \frac{|u|^2}{y^4(1+y^4)(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}+\int \frac{(\partial_y u)^2}{y^2(1+y^4)(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}<\infty,\end{aligned} \tag{6.26}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int \frac{|Hu|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2}+\int \frac{|\partial_y Hu|^2}{y^2(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2} \\
\gtrsim \ & \int \frac{|u|^2}{y^4(1+y^4)(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2}+\int \frac{(\partial_y u)^2}{y^2(1+y^4)(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2} \\
+ \ & \int \frac{|\partial_y^2 u|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2}+\int \frac{(\partial_y^3 u)^2}{y^2(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2} \\
- \ & C\left[\int \frac{(\partial_y u)^2}{1+y^8}+\int \frac{|u|^2}{1+y^{10}}\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{6.27}$$

Proof of Lemma 6.3: Let $\chi(y)$ be a smooth cut-off function with support in $y \geq 1$ and equal to 1 for $y \geq 2$. We first consider

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int \chi \frac{|Hu|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2}=\int \chi \frac{|-\partial_y(y\partial_y u)+\frac{V}{y}u|^2}{y^6(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2} \\
= \ & \int \chi \frac{|\partial_y(y\partial_y u)|^2}{y^6(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2}-2\int \chi \frac{\partial_y(y\partial_y u)\cdot Vu}{y^7(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2}+\int \chi \frac{V^2|u|^2}{y^8(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2} \\
= \ & \int \chi \frac{|\partial_y(y\partial_y u)|^2}{y^6(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2}+2\int \chi \frac{V(\partial_y u)^2}{y^6(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2}+\int \chi \frac{V^2|u|^2}{y^8(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2} \\
- \ & \int |u|^2 \Delta\left(\frac{\chi V}{y^6(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

We now observe that for $k \geq 0$ and $y \geq 1$

$$\partial_y^k V(y)=\partial_y^k(1)+O(y^{-2-k})$$

We may thus apply twice the Hardy inequality with sharp constant (6.19) with $\gamma=6$ and get for a sufficiently large universal constant R:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int \chi \frac{|\partial_y(y\partial_y u)|^2}{y^6(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2}+2\int \chi \frac{V(\partial_y u)^2}{y^6(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2}-\int |u|^2 \Delta\left(\frac{\chi V}{y^6(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2}\right) \\
\geq \ & (9+2)\int_{y\geq R} \frac{(\partial_y u)^2}{y^6(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2}-31\int_{y\geq R} \frac{|u|^2}{y^8(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2}-C\int_{y\geq 1} \frac{(\partial_y u)^2}{y^8} \\
\geq \ & (99-31)\int_{y\geq R} \frac{|u|^2}{y^8(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2}-C\left[\int_{y\geq 1} \frac{(\partial_y u)^2}{y^8}+\int_{y\geq 1} \frac{|u|^2}{y^{10}}\right]
\end{aligned}$$

and hence the bound away from the origin:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int \chi \frac{|Hu|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2} \gtrsim & \int_{y\geq 2} \frac{|\partial_y^2 u|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2}+\int_{y\geq 2} \frac{(\partial_y u)^2}{y^6(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2}+\int_{y\geq 2} \frac{|u|^2}{y^8(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2} \\
& -C\left[\int_{y\geq 1} \frac{(\partial_y u)^2}{y^8}+\int_{y\geq 1} \frac{|u|^2}{y^{10}}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

The control of the third derivative away from the origin follows from:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int \chi \frac{|\partial_y Hu|^2}{y^2(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2}=\int \chi \frac{|\partial_y\left(\frac{1}{y}(-\partial_y(y\partial_y u)+\frac{V}{y^2})u\right)|^2}{y^2(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2} \\
\gtrsim \ & \int \chi \frac{|\partial_y^3 u|^2}{y^2(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2}-C\left[\int \chi \frac{|\partial_y^2 u|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2}+\int \chi \frac{|\partial_y u|^2}{y^6(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2}+\int \chi \frac{|u|^2}{y^8(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Near the origin, we first observe from (6.26) that

$$\int \frac{|Au|^2}{y^2(1+|\mathrm{log} y|^2)} < +\infty. \tag{6.28}$$

We now observe from

$$\partial_y(\log(\Lambda\phi)) = \frac{Z}{y}$$

that

$$A^*f = \partial_y f + \frac{1+Z}{y} f = \frac{1}{y\Lambda\phi}\partial_y(y\Lambda\phi f),$$

and thus from (6.28):

$$Au(y) = \frac{1}{y\Lambda\phi(y)}\int_0^y \tau\Lambda\phi(\tau)Hu(\tau)d\tau. \tag{6.29}$$

We then estimate from Cauchy-Schwarz and Fubini:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{y\leq 1}\frac{|Au|^2}{y^5(1+|\mathrm{log} y|^2)}dy &\lesssim \int_{0\leq y\leq 1}\int_{0\leq\tau\leq y}\frac{y^5}{y^9(1+|\mathrm{log} y|^2)}|Hu(\tau)|^2 dy d\tau\\ \lesssim \int_{0\leq\tau\leq 1}|Hu(\tau)|^2&\left[\int_{\tau\leq y\leq 1}\frac{dy}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log} y|^2)}\right]d\tau \lesssim \int_{\tau\leq 1}\frac{|Hu(\tau)|^2}{\tau^3(1+|\mathrm{log}\tau|^2)}d\tau\end{aligned}$$

and thus:

$$\int_{y\leq 1}\frac{|Au|^2}{y^6(1+|\mathrm{log} y|^2)} \lesssim \int_{y\leq 1}\frac{|Hu|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log} y|^2)} \tag{6.30}$$

which implies from $A^*(Au) = Hu$:

$$\int_{y\leq 1}\frac{|\partial_y Au|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log} y|^2)} \lesssim \int_{y\leq 1}\frac{|Hu|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log} y|^2)}. \tag{6.31}$$

We now rewrite near the origin:

$$Hu = -\partial_y^2 u + \frac{1}{y}\left(-\partial_y u + \frac{u}{y}\right) + \frac{V-1}{y^2}u = -\partial_y^2 u + \frac{Au}{y} + \frac{(V-1)+(1-Z)}{y^2}u$$

which implies using (6.30), (6.31),

$$\int_{y\leq 1}\frac{|\partial_y^2 u|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log} y|^2)} \lesssim \int_{y\leq 1}\frac{|Hu|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log} y|^2)} + \int_{y\leq 1}\frac{|u|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log} y|^2)}, \tag{6.32}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{y\leq 1}\frac{|\partial_y^3 u|^2}{y^2(1+|\mathrm{log} y|^2)} &\lesssim \int_{y\leq 1}\frac{|\partial_y Hu|^2}{y^2(1+|\mathrm{log} y|^2)} + \int_{y\leq 1}\frac{|Hu|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log} y|^2)}\\ &+ \int_{y\leq 1}\frac{|\partial_y u|^2}{y^2(1+|\mathrm{log} y|^2)} + \int_{y\leq 1}\frac{|u|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log} y|^2)}.\end{aligned} \tag{6.33}$$

Let now $\zeta = (1-\chi)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, then ζu satisfies (6.18) from (6.26), (6.30), (6.31), and we thus obtain from (6.19):

$$\begin{aligned}\int \zeta^2\frac{|Hu|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2} &\geq \int \zeta^2|Hu|^2 \gtrsim \int |H\zeta u|^2 - C\int_{1\leq y\leq 2}(|\partial_y u|^2+|u|^2)\\ &\gtrsim \int\frac{|\partial_y(\zeta u)|^2}{y^2(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2} + \int\frac{|\zeta u|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2} - C\int\frac{|\zeta u|^2}{1+y^5}\\ &\gtrsim \int_{y\leq 1}\frac{|\partial_y u|^2}{y^2(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2} + \int_{y\leq 1}\frac{|u|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log} y|)^2} - C\int_{y\leq 2}\frac{|u|^2}{1+y^5}.\end{aligned} \tag{6.34}$$

Injecting (6.32), (6.33) into (6.34) yields the expected control at the origin. This concludes the proof of (6.27) and Lemma 6.3.

We combine the results of Lemma 6.2 and Lemma 6.3 and obtain:

Lemma 6.4 (Sub-coercivity for H^2)**.** *Let u be a radially symmetric function with*

$$\begin{aligned}&\int|\partial_y AHu|^2+\int\frac{|AHu|^2}{y^2(1+y^2)}+\int\frac{|Hu|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2} && (6.35)\\ + & \int\frac{|u|^2}{y^4(1+y^4)(1+|\mathrm{log}y|^2)}+\int\frac{(\partial_y u)^2}{y^2(1+y^4)(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}<\infty\end{aligned}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}&\int|H^2u|^2\gtrsim\int\frac{|Hu|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}+\frac{|\partial_y Hu|^2}{y^2(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}+\int\frac{|\partial_y^3u|^2}{y^2(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2} && (6.36)\\ + & \int\frac{|\partial_y^2u|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}+\int\frac{|\partial_y u|^2}{y^2(1+y^4(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}+\int\frac{|u|^2}{y^4(1+y^4)(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}\\ - & C\left[\int\frac{|Hu|^2}{1+y^5}+\int\frac{(\partial_y u)^2}{1+y^8}+\int\frac{|u|^2}{1+y^{10}}\right]\end{aligned}$$

6.5. **Coercivity of H^2.** We are now in position to derive the fundamental coercivity property of H^2 at the heart of our analysis:

Lemma 6.5 (Coercivity of H^2)**.** *Let $M\geq 1$ be a large enough universal constant. Let Φ_M be given by* (4.1) *. Then there exists a universal constant $C(M)>0$ such that for all radially symmetric function u satisfiyng* (6.35) *and the orthogonality conditions*

$$(u,\Phi_M)=0,\qquad (Hu,\Phi_M)=0,$$

there holds:

$$\begin{aligned}&\int\frac{|Hu|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}+\frac{|\partial_y Hu|^2}{y^2(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}+\int\frac{|\partial_y^4u|^2}{(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}+\int\frac{|\partial_y^3u|^2}{y^2(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}\\ + & \int\frac{|\partial_y^2u|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}+\int\frac{|\partial_y u|^2}{y^2(1+y^4)(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}+\int\frac{|u|^2}{y^4(1+y^4)(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}\\ \leq & C(M)\int|H^2u|^2. && (6.37)\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 6.5. We argue by contradiction. Let $M>0$ fixed and consider a normalized sequence u_n

$$\begin{aligned}&\int\frac{|Hu_n|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}+\frac{|\partial_y Hu_n|^2}{y^2(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}+\int\frac{|\partial_y^3u_n|^2}{y^2(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2} && (6.38)\\ + & \int\frac{|\partial_y^2u_n|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}+\int\frac{|\partial_y u_n|^2}{y^2(1+y^4)(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}+\int\frac{|u_n|^2}{y^4(1+y^4)(1+|\mathrm{log}y|)^2}=1,\end{aligned}$$

satisfying the orthogonality conditions

$$(u_n,\Phi_M)=0,\qquad (u_n,H\Phi_M)=0, \tag{6.39}$$

and

$$\int|H^2u_n|^2\approx\int\frac{|AHu_n|^2}{y^2(1+y^2)}+\int|\nabla(AHu_n)|^2\leq\frac{1}{n}, \tag{6.40}$$

The normalization condition implies that the sequence u_n is uniformly bounded in H^1_{loc}. Moreover, as follows from Lemma 6.3, for any smooth cut-off function ζ

vanishing in a neighborhood of $y = 0$ the sequence ζu_n is uniformly bounded in H^3_{loc}. As a consequence, we can assume that u_n and ζu_n weakly converge in H^1_{loc} and H^3_{loc} to u_∞ and ζu_∞ respectively. Moreover, u_∞ satisfies the equation

$$AHu_\infty = 0$$

away from $y = 0$. Integrating the ODE

$$AHu_\infty = -\Lambda\phi\partial_y\left(\frac{Hu_\infty}{\Lambda\phi}\right) = 0$$

we obtain that $Hu_\infty(y) = \alpha\Lambda\phi(y)$ away from $y = 0$. The function u_∞ can be written in the form

$$\begin{aligned} u_\infty(y) = \alpha\Gamma(y)\int_0^y \Lambda\phi(x)\Lambda\phi(x)xdx - \alpha\Lambda\phi(y)\int_1^y \Lambda\phi(x)\Gamma(x)xdx \\ + \beta\Lambda\phi(y) + \gamma\Gamma(y) = \alpha T_1(y) + \beta\Lambda\phi(y) + \gamma\Gamma(y) \end{aligned}$$

Using the condition $u_\infty \in H^1_{loc}$ we can conclude that $\gamma = 0$. Passing to the limit in the orthogonality conditions, using that u_n converges to u_∞ weakly in H^1_{loc}, we conclude that u_∞ satisfies

$$(u_\infty, \Phi_M) = 0, \qquad (u_\infty, H\Phi_M) = 0.$$

We may therefore determine the constants α, β using (4.1), (4.3) which yield $\alpha = \beta = 0$ and thus $u_\infty = 0$.

The sub-coercitivity bound (6.36) together with (6.40) ensures:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} &\gtrsim \int (H^2u_n)^2 \gtrsim \int \frac{|\partial_y Hu_n|^2}{y^2(1+|\log y|)^2} + \int \frac{|Hu_n|^2}{y^4(1+|\log y|)^2} + \int \frac{|\partial_y^3 u_n|^2}{y^2(1+|\log y|)^2} \\ &+ \int \frac{|\partial_y^2 u_n|^2}{y^4(1+|\log y|)^2} + \int \frac{|\partial_y u_n|^2}{y^2(1+y^4)(1+|\log y|)^2} + \int \frac{|u_n|^2}{y^4(1+y^4)(1+|\log y|)^2} \\ &- C\left[\int \frac{|Hu|^2}{1+y^5} + \int \frac{(\partial_y u_n)^2}{1+y^8} + \int \frac{|u_n|^2}{1+y^{10}}\right] \end{aligned}$$

Coupling this with the normalization condition we obtain that

$$\int \zeta\left[\frac{|Hu_n|^2}{1+y^5} + \int \frac{(\partial_y u_n)^2}{1+y^8} + \int \frac{|u_n|^2}{1+y^{10}}\right] \geq c$$

for some positive constant $c > 0$ and a smooth cut-off function ζ vanishing for $y < \epsilon$ and $y > \epsilon^{-1}$. The size of ϵ depends only on the universal constant C. Since u_n weakly converges to u_∞ in H^3 on any compact subinterval of $y \in (0, \infty)$ we can pass to the limit to conclude

$$\int \zeta\left[\frac{|Hu_\infty|^2}{1+y^5} + \int \frac{(\partial_y u_\infty)^2}{(1+y^8)} + \int \frac{|u_\infty|^2}{(1+y^{10})}\right] \geq c.$$

This contradicts the established identity $u_\infty \equiv 0$ and concludes the proof of Lemma 6.5 modulo the additional bound for

$$\int \frac{|\partial_y^4 u|^2}{(1+|\log y|^2)}$$

claimed in (6.37). To control this term we simply observe that for $y \geq 1$

$$H^2u = H(-\Delta + \frac{V}{y^2})u = \partial_y^4 u + O\left(\sum_{i=0}^3 \frac{|\partial_y^i u|}{y^{4-i}}\right).$$

and the desired estimate easily follows from the already established bounds for lower derivatives. For $y \leq 1$ we write

$$H^2u = H(-\Delta + \frac{V}{y^2})u = \partial_y^4 u + \partial_y^2(\frac{1}{y}\partial_y - \frac{V}{y^2})u + O\left(\frac{|Hu|}{y^2}\right) + O\left(\frac{|\partial_y Hu|}{y}\right).$$

We further note that

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_y^2(\frac{1}{y}\partial_y - \frac{V}{y^2})u &= \partial_y^2\left(\frac{1}{y}Au\right) + \partial_y^2\left(O(1)u\right) = \frac{1}{y}\partial_y^2(Au) - \frac{2}{y}\partial_y(Au) + \frac{4}{y^3}Au + \partial_y^2\left(O(1)u\right)\\ &= O\left(\frac{|\partial_y Hu|}{y}\right) + O\left(\frac{|Hu|}{y^2}\right) + O\left(\frac{|Au|}{y^3}\right) + \partial_y^2\left(O(1)u\right).\end{aligned}$$

The estimate for $y \leq 1$ now follows from the bounds for $\partial_y Hu$, Hu and the coercivity estimate (6.30) for Au.

6.6. Coercivity of H.

We complement the coercitivity property of the operator H^2, established in the previous section, by the corresponding statement for the operator H, which follows from standard compactness argument. A complete proof[4] is given in [33]:

Lemma 6.6 (Coercivity of H). *Let $M \geq 1$ fixed. Then there exists $c(M) > 0$ such that the following holds true. Let $u \in H^1$ with*

$$(u, \Phi_M) = 0$$

and

$$\int \frac{|u|^2}{y^4(1+|\text{log}y|)^2} + \int |\partial_y(Au)|^2 < +\infty, \tag{6.41}$$

then:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{|y|\geq 1} \frac{\partial_y^2 u}{1+|\text{log}y|^2} + \int \frac{|\partial_y u|^2}{y^2(1+|\text{log}y|)^2} + \int \frac{|u|^2}{y^4(1+|\text{log}y|)^2}\\ \leq\ & c(M)\left[\int \frac{|Au|^2}{y^2(1+y^2)} + \int |\partial_y(Au)|^2\right]\\ \lesssim\ & c(M)\int |Hu|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{6.42}$$

Appendix B: Interpolation estimates

We derive interpolation bounds in the bootstrap regime of Proposition 4.2 and in the regime of parameters described by Remark 4.3. We recall the notation:

$$\mathbf{w} = \left|\begin{array}{l}\alpha\\ \beta\\ \gamma\end{array}\right. = \mathbf{w}^{\perp} + \gamma e_z$$

---

[4] In [33] the argument was carried out with the orthogonality condition $(u, \chi_M \Lambda\phi) = 0$. Here we require that $(u, \Phi_M) = 0$, which is sufficient in view of (4.3), according to which $(\chi_{2M}\Lambda\phi, \Phi_M) = (\chi_M\Lambda\phi, \Lambda\phi) = 4\text{log}M(1 + o_{M\to+\infty}(1))$.

and the norms $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{E}_4$, introduced in (4.7), together with their bootstrap bounds (4.13), (4.14), (4.15) :

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_1 &= \int (|\nabla \mathbf{w}|^2 + \frac{|\mathbf{w}|^2}{y^2}) \le K\delta(b^*),\\
\mathcal{E}_2 &= \int |R_z \mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2 = \int (|H\alpha|^2 + |H\beta|^2) \le K b^2(t) |\mathrm{log} b(t)|^5,\\
\mathcal{E}_4 &= \int |(R_z\mathbb{H})^2 \mathbf{w}^\perp|^2 = \int (|H^2\alpha|^2 + |H^2\beta|^2) \le K \frac{b^4(t)}{|\mathrm{log} b(t)|^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

6.7. **Regularity at the origin.** The use of the coercivity bounds in Appendix A and the interpolation estimates below requires establishing a priori regularity of the Schrödinger map u, expressed in Frenet basis, at the origin. We will show that the smoothness of the map $u(t) : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{S}^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ implies boundedness of the quantities

$$\left|\frac{\mathbf{w}}{y}\right|, \quad |\partial_y \mathbf{w}|, \quad \left|\frac{A\mathbf{w}^\perp}{y}\right|, \quad \left|\frac{H\mathbf{w}^\perp}{y}\right|, \quad \left|\frac{AH\mathbf{w}^\perp}{y}\right|, \quad \left|\partial_y AH\mathbf{w}^\perp\right|$$

We first consider the expression $\nabla u = (\partial_y u, \frac{1}{y}\partial_\theta u)$ which, as long as u is smooth, is bounded at the origin. Using Lemma 2.1 we compute this in terms of $(\hat\alpha, \hat\beta, \hat\gamma)$ Frenet coordinates of u:

$$\left((\partial_y\hat\alpha + (1+Z)(1+\hat\gamma))e_r + \partial_y\hat\beta e_\tau + (\partial_y\hat\gamma - (1+Z)\hat\alpha)Q, -\frac{Z}{y}\hat\beta e_r + (\frac{Z}{y}\hat\alpha + \frac{\Lambda\phi}{y}(1+\hat\gamma))e_\tau - \frac{\Lambda\phi}{y}\hat\beta Q\right).$$

This immediately implies boundedness of

$$\left|\frac{\mathbf{w}}{y}\right|, \quad |\partial_y \mathbf{w}|$$

Similarly, computing the expression $\Delta u + |\nabla Q|^2 u$ from (2.19)

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta u + |\nabla Q|^2 v = {} & (-H\hat\alpha + 2(1+Z)\partial_y\hat\gamma)\, e_r + (-H\hat\beta)e_\tau\\
& + \left(-\frac{2Z(1+Z)}{y}\hat\alpha + \Delta\hat\gamma - 2(1+Z)\partial_y\hat\alpha\right) Q
\end{aligned}$$

gives us the boundedness of $|H\mathbf{w}^\perp|$ and $|\Delta\gamma|$.

Using cartesian coordinates $x = (x_1, x_2)$ on $\mathbb{R}^2$ we examine the expressions

$$\lim_{x_2=0, x_1\to 0} \nabla_{x_1} u = \lim_{x_1=0, x_2\to 0} \nabla_{x_1} u.$$

Computing this in polar coordinates and relative to the Frenet basis we immediately obtain the relations

$$\partial_y\hat\alpha = \frac{1}{y}\hat\alpha, \quad \partial_y\hat\beta = \frac{1}{y}\hat\beta$$

in the limit as $y \to 0$. This immediately gives the boundedness of

$$\left|\frac{A\alpha}{y}\right|, \quad \left|\frac{A\beta}{y}\right|.$$

The remaining bounds can be shown by similar arguments. We omit the details.

6.8. **Interpolation bounds for $\mathbf{w}$.** We now turn to the proof of interpolation estimates for $\mathbf{w}$ in the bootstrap regimes which are used all along the proof of Proposition 4.2.

Lemma 6.7 (Interpolation estimates for $\mathbf{w}^\perp$). *There holds:*

$$\int \frac{|\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2}{y^4(1+y^4)(1+|\log y|^2)}+\int \frac{|\partial_y^i\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2}{y^2(1+y^{6-2i})(1+|\log y|^2)} \tag{6.43}$$

$$\lesssim C(M)\mathcal{E}_4, \quad 1\leq i\leq 3, \tag{6.44}$$

$$\int_{|y|\geq 1} \frac{|\partial_y^i\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2}{(1+y^{4-2i})(1+|\log y|^2)}\lesssim C(M)\mathcal{E}_2, \quad 1\leq i\leq 2, \tag{6.45}$$

$$\int_{y\geq 1}\frac{1+|\log y|^C}{y^2(1+|\log y|^2)(1+y^{6-2i})}|\partial_y^i\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2\lesssim b^4|\log b|^{C_1(C)}, \quad 0\leq i\leq 3, \tag{6.46}$$

$$\int_{y\geq 1}\frac{1+|\log y|^C}{y^2(1+|\log y|^2)(1+y^{4-2i})}|\partial_y^i\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2\lesssim b^3|\log b|^{C_1(C)}, \quad 0\leq i\leq 2, \tag{6.47}$$

$$\int_{|y|\geq 1}|\partial_y\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2\lesssim b^3|\log b|^6. \tag{6.48}$$

$$\|\mathbf{w}^\perp\|_{L^\infty}\lesssim \delta(b^*), \tag{6.49}$$

$$\|\mathbb{A}\mathbf{w}^\perp\|^2_{L^\infty}\lesssim b^2|\log b|^9, \tag{6.50}$$

$$\int_{y\leq 1}\frac{|\mathbb{A}\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2}{y^6(1+|\log y|^2)}\lesssim C(M)\mathcal{E}_4, \tag{6.51}$$

$$\left\|\frac{\mathbb{A}\mathbf{w}^\perp}{y^2(1+|\log y|)}\right\|^2_{L^\infty(y\leq 1)}+\left\|\frac{\Delta\mathbb{A}\mathbf{w}^\perp}{1+|\log y|}\right\|^2_{L^\infty(y\leq 1)}+\left\|\frac{\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}^\perp}{y(1+|\log y|)}\right\|^2_{L^\infty(y\leq 1)}\lesssim b^4, \tag{6.52}$$

$$\left\|\frac{|H\alpha|+|H\beta|}{y(1+|\log y|)}\right\|^2_{L^\infty(y\leq 1)}\lesssim b^4, \tag{6.53}$$

$$\|\frac{\mathbf{w}^\perp}{y}\|^2_{L^\infty(y\leq 1)}+\|\partial_y\mathbf{w}^\perp\|^2_{L^\infty(y\leq 1)}\lesssim b^4, \tag{6.54}$$

$$\|\frac{\mathbf{w}^\perp}{y}\|^2_{L^\infty(y\geq 1)}+\|\partial_y\mathbf{w}^\perp\|^2_{L^\infty(y\geq 1)}\lesssim b^2|\log b|^8, \tag{6.55}$$

$$\|\frac{\mathbf{w}^\perp}{1+y^2}\|^2_{L^\infty}+\|\frac{\partial_y\mathbf{w}^\perp}{1+y}\|^2_{L^\infty}+\|\partial_{yy}\mathbf{w}^\perp\|^2_{L^\infty(y\geq 1)}\lesssim C(M)b^3|\log b|^2. \tag{6.56}$$

Proof of Lemma 6.7: The estimate (6.49) follows from the $\mathcal{E}_1$ bound:

$$\|\mathbf{w}^\perp\|^2_{L^\infty}\lesssim \|\partial_y\mathbf{w}^\perp\|^2_{L^2}+\|\frac{\mathbf{w}^\perp}{y}\|^2_{L^2}\lesssim \delta(b^*).$$

The estimate (6.43) follows from H^2 coercivity of Lemma 6.5 and the $\mathcal{E}_4$ bound. For $i=0,1,2$ (6.46) is easily implied by Lemma 6.6 and the $\mathcal{E}_2$ bound. For $i=3$ we split the integral at $y=B_0^{20}$ and estimate the inner contribution using Lemma 6.5 and the $\mathcal{E}_4$ bound, and the outer by interpolating between the $\mathcal{E}_4$ and $\mathcal{E}_2$ bounds:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{y\geq 1}\frac{(1+|\log y|^C)|\partial_y^3\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2}{y^2(1+y^4)(1+|\log y|^2)}\\
\leq\ &\int_{1\leq y\leq B_0^{20}}\frac{(1+|\log y|^C)|\partial_y^3\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2}{y^2(1+y^4)(1+|\log y|^2)}+\int_{y\geq B_0^{20}}\frac{(1+|\log y|^C)|\partial_y^3\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2}{y^2(1+y^4)(1+|\log y|^2)}\\
\lesssim\ &|\log b|^{C+2}\mathcal{E}_4+B_0^{-20}(\log B_0)^C\mathcal{E}_2^{\frac12}\mathcal{E}_4^{\frac12}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the estimate (6.47) follows by splitting the integral at $y = B_0$ and using the $\mathcal{E}_4$ and $\mathcal{E}_2$ bounds for the inner and outer regions respectively.
To obtain (6.48) we write

$$\partial_y H\alpha = -AH\alpha + \frac{Z}{y} H\alpha,$$

which, using the $\mathcal{E}_2$ and $\mathcal{E}_4$ bounds, implies with $B \in [B_0, 2B_0]$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{|y|\geq 1} |\partial_y H\alpha|^2 \lesssim \int_{1\leq |y|\leq B} |\partial_y H\alpha|^2 + \int_{|y|\geq B} \left(|AH\alpha|^2 + \frac{|H\alpha|^2}{y^2}\right)\\
\lesssim\ & b^3|\log b|^2 + \int_{|y|\geq B} |A^*AH\alpha\, H\alpha| + |y||AH\alpha\, H\alpha|_{|y|=B} + b^3|\log b|^6\\
\lesssim\ & b^3|\log b|^6 + \int_{|y|\geq B_0} |H^2\alpha\, H\alpha| + \frac{1}{B_0}\int_{B_0}^{2B_0} |AH\alpha\, H\alpha|\\
\lesssim\ & b^3|\log b|^6 + \left(\int_{|y|\geq B_0} |H^2\alpha|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{|y|\geq B_0} |H\alpha|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left(\int_{B_0}^{2B_0} \frac{|AH\alpha|^2}{y^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{B_0}^{2B_0} |H\alpha|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
\lesssim\ & b^3|\log b|^6.
\end{aligned}$$

To prove (6.54) and (6.55) let $a \in [1, 2]$ such that

$$|\partial_y \mathbf{w}^{\perp}(a)|^2 \lesssim \int_{1\leq y\leq 2} |\partial_y \mathbf{w}|^2 \leq C(M)\mathcal{E}_4,$$

then for $y \leq 1$:

$$|\partial_y \mathbf{w}^{\perp}| \lesssim |\partial_y \mathbf{w}^{\perp}(a)| + \int_y^a |\partial_{yy}\mathbf{w}^{\perp}| dy \leq C(M)\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_4} \lesssim b^2,$$

and for $y \geq 1$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\partial_y \mathbf{w}^{\perp}\right\|^2_{L^\infty(y\geq 1)} &\lesssim \left(\int_{y\geq 1} \frac{|\partial_y \mathbf{w}^{\perp}|^2}{y^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{y\geq 1} |\partial_{yy}\mathbf{w}^{\perp}|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\\
&\lesssim \int_{y\geq 1} \frac{|\partial_y \mathbf{w}^{\perp}|^2}{y^2} + \int_{y\geq 1} \frac{|\mathbf{w}^{\perp}|^2}{y^4} + \int |A^*A\mathbf{w}^{\perp}|^2\\
&\lesssim b^2|\log b|^8,
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we split the integral at $y = B_0^2$ and use $\mathcal{E}_2$ bound for the inner and $\mathcal{E}_1$ for the outer parts. Next, we have from $\mathbf{w}^{\perp}(0) = 0$:

$$\left\|\frac{\mathbf{w}^{\perp}}{y}\right\|_{L^\infty(y\leq 1)} \lesssim \|\partial_y \mathbf{w}^{\perp}\|_{L^\infty(y\leq 1)}$$

and

$$\left\|\frac{\mathbf{w}^{\perp}}{y}\right\|^2_{L^\infty(y\geq 1)} \lesssim \int_{y\geq 1} \frac{|\partial_y \mathbf{w}^{\perp}|^2}{y^2} + \int_{y\geq 1} \frac{|\mathbf{w}^{\perp}|^2}{y^4}. \tag{6.57}$$

The estimates (6.54) and (6.55) now easily follow.
The estimate (6.51) follows directly from (6.30).
For (6.50):

$$\|A\alpha\|^2_{L^\infty} \lesssim \left(\int \frac{|A\alpha|^2}{y^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int |\partial_y A\alpha|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim b^2|\log b|^9,$$

where in the last step we used the coercivity of H of Lemma 6.6, split the first integral at $y=B_0^2$ and used the $\mathcal{E}_2$ bound for inner and the $\mathcal{E}_1$ for the outer parts. For (6.52), we recall from (6.29):

$$H\alpha = A^*A\alpha \ \text{ and thus } \ A\alpha = \frac{1}{y\Lambda\phi}\int_0^y z\Lambda\phi(H\alpha)dz.$$

This yields for $y\leq 1$:

$$|A\alpha(y)| \lesssim \frac{1}{y^2}\left(\int\frac{|H\alpha|^2}{y^4(1+|\text{log}y|^2)}\right)^{\frac12}\left(\int_0^y(1+|\text{log}z|^2)z^3z^4dz\right)^{\frac12}\lesssim y^2(1+|\text{log}y|)\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_4}.$$

Similarily,

$$AH\alpha = \frac{1}{y\Lambda\phi}\int_0^y z\Lambda\phi(H^2\alpha)dz$$

yields for $y\leq 1$:

$$|\tilde{H}A\alpha(y)| = |AH\alpha(y)| \lesssim \frac{1}{y^2}\left(\int|H^2(\alpha)|^2\right)^{\frac12}\left(\int_0^y\frac{z^4}{z}dz\right)^{\frac12}\lesssim\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_4}. \tag{6.58}$$

This implies for $y\leq 1$:

$$|\Delta A(\alpha)(y)| \lesssim |\tilde{H}(A\alpha)(y)| + \frac{|A\alpha(y)|}{y^2}\lesssim\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_4}(1+|\text{log}y|).$$

Similar estimates can be shown for β and the last term in (6.52). Let now $a\in[1,2]$ be such that

$$|H\alpha|^2(a)\lesssim\int_{1\leq y\leq 2}|H\alpha|^2\lesssim\mathcal{E}_4,$$

then from

$$Af = -\Lambda\phi\partial_y\left(\frac{f}{\Lambda\phi}\right), \tag{6.59}$$

there holds for $y\leq 1$:

$$|H\alpha(y)|\leq\Lambda\phi(y)\left[\frac{|H\alpha|(a)}{\Lambda\phi(a)}+\int_y^a\frac{|AH\alpha|}{\Lambda\phi}dz\right]\lesssim|y|(1+|\text{log}y|)\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_4},$$

where in the last step we used the coercivity of A^*. The bound (6.53) follows. For (6.56):

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\frac{\mathbf{w}^\perp}{1+y^2}\right\|_{L^\infty}^2 &\lesssim \left(\int\frac{|\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2}{y^2(1+y^4)}\right)^{\frac12}\left(\int\left|\partial_y\left(\frac{\mathbf{w}^\perp}{1+y^2}\right)\right|^2\right)^{\frac12}\\ &\lesssim \int\frac{|\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2}{y^2(1+y^4)}+\int\frac{|\partial_y\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2}{1+y^4}\end{aligned}$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned}\int\frac{|\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2}{y^2(1+y^4)} &\lesssim \frac{|\text{log}b|^2}{b}\int_{y\leq B_0}\frac{|\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2}{y^4(1+y^4)(1+|\text{log}y|^2)}+\|\mathbf{w}^\perp\|_{L^\infty}^2\int_{y\geq B_0}\frac{1}{1+y^8}\\ &\lesssim b^3|\text{log}b|^2.\end{aligned}$$

The argument for the other terms is similar, and (6.56) is proved.

Lemma 6.8 (Interpolation bound for $\gamma=w^z$)**.** *There holds:*

$$\begin{aligned}&\int\frac{|\gamma|^2}{y^6(1+y^2)(1+|\text{log}y|^2)}+\int\frac{|\partial_y\gamma|^2}{y^4(1+y^{4-2i})(1+|\text{log}y|^2)}+\int\frac{|\partial_y^i\gamma|^2}{y^2(1+y^{6-2i})(1+|\text{log}y|^2)}\\ &\lesssim\delta(b^*)\left(\frac{b^4}{|\text{log}b|^2}+\mathcal{E}_4\right),\quad 2\leq i\leq 3,\end{aligned} \tag{6.60}$$

$$\int_{y\geq 1}\frac{1+|\mathrm{log}y|^C}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log}y|^2)(1+y^{4-2i})}|\partial_y^i\gamma|^2\lesssim b^4|\mathrm{log}b|^{C_1(C)},\quad 0\leq i\leq 2,\tag{6.61}$$

$$\int_{y\geq 1}\frac{1+|\mathrm{log}y|^C}{y^{6-2i}(1+|\mathrm{log}y|^2)}|\partial_y^i\gamma|^2\lesssim b^3|\mathrm{log}b|^{C_1(C)},\quad 0\leq i\leq 2,\tag{6.62}$$

$$\int\frac{|A\partial_y\gamma|^2}{y^4(1+|\mathrm{log}y|^2)}\leq\delta(b^*)\left(\frac{b^4}{|\mathrm{log}b|^2}+\mathcal{E}_4\right),\tag{6.63}$$

$$\|\gamma\frac{1+|y|}{|y|}\|_{L^\infty}\lesssim\delta(b^*),\tag{6.64}$$

$$\|\frac{(1+|y|)\gamma}{y^2}\|^2_{L^\infty}+\|\partial_y\gamma\|^2_{L^\infty}\lesssim b^2|\mathrm{log}b|^8,\tag{6.65}$$

$$\|\frac{\gamma}{|y|(1+|y|)}\|^2_{L^\infty}+\|\frac{\partial_y\gamma}{|y|}\|^2_{L^\infty}\lesssim C(M)b^3|\mathrm{log}b|^2,\tag{6.66}$$

$$\int|\Delta\gamma|^2\lesssim\delta(b^*)\mathcal{E}_2+b^2|\mathrm{log}b|^2\tag{6.67}$$

$$\|\Delta\gamma\|^2_{L^\infty(y\geq 1)}\lesssim b^3|\mathrm{log}b|^8,\tag{6.68}$$

$$\int|\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2|\Delta^2\gamma|^2+\int_{y\geq 1}|\Delta^2\gamma|^2\lesssim\delta(b^*)\left(\mathcal{E}_4+\frac{b^4}{|\mathrm{log}b|^2}\right).\tag{6.69}$$

Proof of Lemma 6.8 Recall the normalization relation:

$$(1+\hat\gamma)^2+\hat\alpha^2+\hat\beta^2=1.$$

We expand to get:

$$2\gamma=-\Big[(2\tilde\gamma_0+\tilde\beta_0^2)+\tilde\alpha_0^2+\alpha(\alpha+2\tilde\alpha_0)+\beta(\beta+\tilde\alpha_0)\Big]-(\gamma+\tilde\gamma_0)^2.\tag{6.70}$$

Note also by construction (3.4) that the leading order $(2\tilde\gamma_0+\tilde\beta_0^2)$ contribution to γ is cancelled on $y\leq 2B_1$,
and we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}\int\frac{|\gamma|^2}{y^6(1+y^2)(1+|\mathrm{log}y|^2)} &\lesssim \left(\left|\mathbf{w}^\perp\frac{1+|y|}{|y|}\right|^2_{L^\infty}+\left|\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0^\perp\frac{1+|y|}{|y|}\right|^2_{L^\infty}\right)\int\frac{|\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2}{y^4(1+y^4)(1+|\mathrm{log}y|^2)}\\ &+\ O\left(\frac{b^4}{|\mathrm{log}b|^4}\right)\lesssim\delta(b^*)\left(\frac{b^4}{|\mathrm{log}b|^2}+\mathcal{E}_4\right)\end{aligned}$$

from (6.49) and (6.54) for $\mathbf{w}^\perp$ and the corresponding bounds for $\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0$. The remaining estimates in (6.60), (6.61), (6.62), (6.64), (6.65) and (6.66) are obtained similarily from (6.70) and the corresponding statements for $\mathbf{w}^\perp$. We omit the details.
The estimate (6.63) for $y\geq 1$ follows from (6.8) and the challenge here is the behavior of the integrand at the origin. To treat we write

$$A\partial_y\gamma=-\partial_y^2\gamma+\frac{Z}{y}\partial_y\gamma.$$

Therefore for $y\leq 1$:

$$\begin{aligned}|A\partial_y\gamma|\lesssim{}&|A\partial_y(\tilde\alpha_0^2)|+|\mathbf{w}^\perp|(|\partial_y^2\mathbf{w}^\perp|+|\partial_y^2\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0|)+|\partial_y^2\mathbf{w}^\perp|(|\mathbf{w}^\perp|+|\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0|)\\ &+\left(|\partial_y\mathbf{w}^\perp|+\frac{|\mathbf{w}^\perp|}{|y|}\right)\left(|\partial_y\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0|+\frac{|\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0|}{|y|}\right)+|\partial_y\mathbf{w}^\perp|\,|A\mathbf{w}^\perp|.\end{aligned}$$

The most important aspect of this formula is the last term containing $A\mathbf{w}^\perp$ and providing the necessary vanishing at the origin from Lemma 6.7:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{y\leq 1}\frac{|A\partial_y\gamma|^2}{y^4(1+|\log y|^2))} &\leq \frac{b^4}{|\log b|^4}+\delta(b^*)\mathcal{E}_4+\int_{y\leq 1}\frac{|\partial_y\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2\,|A\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2}{y^4(1+y^2)(1+|\log y|^2)}\\ &\lesssim \frac{b^4}{|\log b|^2}.\end{aligned}$$

We now turn to the proof of (6.67). We first estimate in brute force from (3.15), (3.16) and the relation $HT_1=\Lambda Q$:

$$\begin{aligned}\int|\mathbb{H}\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0|^2 &\lesssim \int\left[|H\tilde{\alpha}_0|^2+|H\tilde{\beta}_0|^2+\int|\Delta\tilde{\gamma}_0|^2+\frac{|\partial_y\tilde{\gamma}_0|^2+|\partial_y\tilde{\alpha}_0|^2+\frac{|\tilde{\alpha}_0|^2}{y^2}}{1+y^4}\right]\\ &\lesssim b^2+\int_{y\leq 2B_1}\left|\frac{b}{1+y}+\frac{b^3y^3}{(1+y^2)|\log b|}\right|^2\lesssim b^2|\log b|^2, \qquad (6.71)\end{aligned}$$

and similarily:

$$\int\frac{|\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0|^2}{1+y^4}\lesssim b^2+\int_{y\leq 2B_1}\left|\frac{b|\log y|}{1+y}+\frac{b^3y^3}{(1+y^2)|\log b|}\right|^2\lesssim b^2|\log b|^3.$$

We now use this and the estimates of Lemma 6.7 and the properties of the profile $\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0$ to estimate:

$$\begin{aligned}&\int|\Delta\gamma|^2\lesssim b^2|\log b|^2\\ &+\int|\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2(|\Delta\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2+|\Delta\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0|^2)+\int|\Delta\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2(|\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2+|\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0|^2)+\int|\nabla\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2(|\nabla\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2+|\nabla\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0|^2)\end{aligned}$$

We then estimate from (6.55), (6.71):

$$\begin{aligned}\int|\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2|\Delta\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0|^2 &\lesssim b^2|\log b|^2+\int|\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2\frac{|\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0|^2}{y^4}\lesssim b^2|\log b|^2+\left\|\frac{\mathbf{w}^\perp}{1+y}\right\|^2_{L^\infty}\int\frac{|\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0|^2}{1+y^2}\\ &\lesssim b^2|\log b|^2,\end{aligned}$$

$$\int|\nabla\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2|\nabla\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0|^2\lesssim\|\partial_y\mathbf{w}^\perp\|^2_{L^\infty}\sqrt{b}|\log b|^C\lesssim b^2|\log b|^2,$$

and using (6.45):

$$\int|\Delta\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2|\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0|^2\lesssim\sqrt{b}b^2|\log b|^C\lesssim b^2|\log b|^2,$$

and thus arrive to the bound:

$$\int|\Delta\gamma|^2\lesssim b^2|\log b|^2+\int|\Delta\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2|\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2+\int|\nabla\mathbf{w}^\perp|^4.$$

From (6.43) we easily see that

$$\int_{y\leq 1}|\Delta\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2|\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2+\int_{y\leq 1}|\nabla\mathbf{w}^\perp|^4\leq C(M)\mathcal{E}_4\leq b^4.$$

For $y\geq 1$ we write

$$|\Delta\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2\lesssim|H\alpha|^2+|H\beta|^2+\frac{|\mathbf{w}^\perp|^2}{y^4},\qquad |\partial_y\mathbf{w}^\perp|^4\lesssim|A\mathbf{w}^\perp|^4+\frac{|\mathbf{w}^\perp|^4}{y^4}$$

and estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{y\geq 1}|\Delta \mathbf{w}^{\perp}|^2|\mathbf{w}^{\perp}|^2+\int_{y\leq 1}|\nabla \mathbf{w}^{\perp}|^4 & \lesssim \|\mathbf{w}^{\perp}\|^2_{L^\infty(y\geq 1)}\int_{y\geq 1}|H\mathbf{w}^{\perp}|^2+\int_{y\geq 1}|A\mathbf{w}^{\perp}|^4+\int_{y\geq 1}\frac{|\mathbf{w}^{\perp}|^4}{y^4}\\ & \lesssim \delta(b^*)\mathcal{E}_2+\int_{y\geq 1}\frac{|\mathbf{w}^{\perp}|^4}{y^4} \qquad (6.72)\end{aligned}$$

where we used (6.49) and the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality

$$\int|A\mathbf{w}^{\perp}|^4\lesssim\int|\partial_yA\mathbf{w}^{\perp}|^2\int|A\mathbf{w}^{\perp}|^2\lesssim\delta(b^*)\left[(\tilde{H}A\alpha,\alpha)+(\tilde{H}A\beta,\beta)\right]=\delta(b^*)\mathcal{E}_2.$$

Hence (6.67) follows from:

$$\int_{y\geq 1}\frac{|\mathbf{w}^{\perp}|^4}{y^4}\lesssim b^2+\delta(b^*)\mathcal{E}_2. \qquad (6.73)$$

Indeed, let a cut-off function with $\psi(y)=0$ for $y\leq 1$ and $\psi(y)=1$ for $y\geq 2$. We compute:

$$\begin{aligned}\int\psi\frac{\alpha^4}{y^4} & = -\frac{1}{2}\int\psi|\alpha|^4\partial_y\left(\frac{1}{y^2}\right)dy=\frac{1}{2}\int\frac{1}{y^3}\left[|\alpha|^4\partial_y\psi+4\psi\alpha^3\partial_y\alpha\right]\\ & \leq C\int_{1\leq y\leq 2}\frac{(\alpha)^4}{y^4}+2\int\psi\frac{(\alpha)^3}{y^3}\left[\frac{Z}{y}\alpha-A\alpha\right]\\ & \leq b^4+\int\psi\frac{|\alpha|^2}{y^6}-2\int\psi\frac{(\alpha)^3}{y^3}\left[\frac{1}{y}\alpha+A\alpha\right]\\ & \leq b^2-2\int\psi\frac{(\alpha)^3}{y^3}\left[\frac{1}{y}\alpha+A\alpha\right]\end{aligned}$$

where we used that $|Z(y)+1|\lesssim\frac{1}{y^2}$ for $y\geq 1$ and (6.47). We now use Hölder and Sobolev inequalities to derive:

$$\begin{aligned}3\int\psi\frac{\alpha^4}{y^4} & \lesssim b^2+\int\psi\frac{\alpha^4}{y^4}+C\int|A\alpha|^4\lesssim b^2+\int\psi\frac{\alpha^4}{y^4}+\int\psi\frac{\alpha^4}{y^4}+\|A\alpha\|^2_{L^2}\|\partial_yA\alpha\|^2_{L^2}\\ & \lesssim b^2+\delta(b^*)\|H\alpha\|^2_{L^2}+\int\psi\frac{\alpha^4}{y^4}\end{aligned}$$

and (6.73) follows.
The L^∞ bound (6.68) follows from:

$$|\Delta\gamma|^2_{L^\infty(y\geq 1)}\lesssim\left(\int_{y\geq 1}\frac{|\partial_y\Delta\gamma|^2}{y^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\int_{y\geq 1}|\Delta\gamma|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\lesssim b^3|\mathrm{log}b|^8.$$

It remains to prove (6.69). Using (6.70), we treat the most delicate quadratic term, other terms are treated similarily and are easier to handle. We claim:

$$\int|\alpha|^2|\Delta^2(\alpha^2)|^2\lesssim\delta(b^*)\left(\mathcal{E}_4+\frac{b^4}{|\mathrm{log}b|^2}\right). \qquad (6.74)$$

To treat the singularity at the origin, we write

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(\alpha^2) & = 2|\partial_y\alpha|^2+2\alpha\Delta\alpha=2|\partial_y\alpha|^2-2\alpha H\alpha+2V\left(\frac{\alpha}{y}\right)^2\\ & = 2|\partial_y\alpha|^2-2\alpha H\alpha+2V\left(A\alpha+\partial_y\alpha+\frac{1-Z}{y}\alpha\right)^2.\end{aligned}$$

Taking another Laplacian and multiplying by α now yields sufficient vanishing at the origin to close the L^2 estimate (6.74) near the origin using the estimates of Lemma 6.7. Far out, we write

$$\Delta(\alpha^2) = 2|\partial_y\alpha|^2 - 2\alpha H\alpha + 2\left(\frac{\alpha}{y}\right)^2 + 2(V-1)\left(\frac{\alpha}{y}\right)^2.$$

The contribution of the last term is easily estimated using the extra decay $|V-1| \lesssim \frac{1}{1+y^2}$. We next compute:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{y\geq 1} & |\alpha|^2|\Delta(|\partial_y\alpha|^2)|^2 \lesssim \|\alpha\|^2_{L^\infty}\left[\int_{y\geq 1}\left(|\partial_y^2\alpha|^2+|\partial_y\alpha||\Delta\partial_y\alpha|\right)^2\right]\\ \lesssim & \ \|\alpha\|^2_{L^\infty}\left[\int_{y\geq 1}\left(|H\alpha|^2+|\partial_y\alpha||\partial_yH\alpha|+\frac{1}{y}|\partial_y\alpha||H\alpha|+\sum_{i,k=0}^{1}\frac{1}{y^{4-i-k}}|\partial_y^i\alpha|\,|\partial_y^k\alpha|\right)^2\right]\\ \lesssim & \left(\|\frac{\partial_y\alpha}{y}\|^2_{L^\infty(y\geq 1)}+\|H\alpha\|^2_{L^\infty(y\geq 1)}\right)b^2|\log b|^6+\left(\|\frac{\alpha}{y}\|^2_{L^\infty(y\geq 1)}+\|\partial_y\alpha\|^2_{L^\infty(y\geq 1)}\right)b^3|\log b|^{10}\\ \lesssim & \ \delta(b^*)\frac{b^4}{|\log b|^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Next, we write:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(\alpha H\alpha) &= \Delta\alpha H\alpha + 2\partial_y\alpha\partial_yH\alpha + \alpha\left(-H^2\alpha+\frac{V}{y^2}H\alpha\right)\\ &= \Delta\alpha H\alpha + 2\partial_y\alpha\partial_yH\alpha - \alpha H^2\alpha + H\alpha(\Delta\alpha + H\alpha).\end{aligned}$$

The contribution of all other terms can be treated in a fashion similar to the previous argument.

This concludes the proof of Lemma 6.8.

6.9. Interpolation bounds for $\mathbf{w}_2$.

We recall that

$$\mathbf{w}_2 = \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}, \quad \widehat{J} = (e_z + \widehat{\mathbf{w}})\wedge$$

and the decomposition from (4.37):

$$\mathbf{w}_2 = \mathbf{w}_2^0 + \mathbf{w}_2^1, \quad \mathbf{w}_2^0 = R_z\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}^\perp, \quad \mathbf{w}_3 = R_z\mathbb{A}\mathbf{w}_2^0. \tag{6.75}$$

From the explicit definition (2.26) of $\mathbb{H}$, we have the formula:

$$\mathbf{w}_2^1 = \mathbf{w}_2^2 + \widehat{\mathbf{w}}\wedge\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}, \quad \mathbf{w}_2^2 = R_z\left|\begin{array}{l} -2(1+Z)\partial_y\gamma \\ 0 \\ 0\end{array}\right. . \tag{6.76}$$

Lemma 6.9 (Interpolation bounds for $\mathbf{w}_2$). *There holds:*

$$\int|\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}|^2 = \int|\mathbf{w}_2|^2 = \mathcal{E}_2 + O(b^2|\log b|^2 + \delta(b^*)\mathcal{E}_2), \tag{6.77}$$

$$\int|\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}|^2 \lesssim \mathcal{E}_2 + b^2|\log b|^2, \tag{6.78}$$

$$\int\frac{|\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}|^2}{(1+y^4)(1+|\log y|^2)} \lesssim C(M)\mathcal{E}_4, \tag{6.79}$$

$$\int\frac{|\mathbf{w}_2^0|^2}{(1+y^4)(1+|\log y|^2)} \lesssim C(M)\mathcal{E}_4, \tag{6.80}$$

$$\int\frac{|\mathbf{w}_2^1|^2}{(1+y^4)(1+|\log y|^2)} \lesssim \delta(b^*)\left(\frac{b^4}{|\log b|^2}+\mathcal{E}_4\right), \tag{6.81}$$

$$\int |\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}_2|^2 \lesssim C(M)\left(\mathcal{E}_4+\frac{b^4}{|\mathrm{log} b|^2}\right), \tag{6.82}$$

$$\int |\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}_2|^2 \lesssim \mathcal{E}_4+\frac{b^4}{|\mathrm{log} b|^2}, \tag{6.83}$$

$$\int |\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}_2^1|^2+\int |R_z\mathbb{H}(R_z^2\mathbf{w}_2^1)|^2 \lesssim \delta(b^*)\left(\mathcal{E}_4+\frac{b^4}{|\mathrm{log} b|^2}\right), \tag{6.84}$$

$$\int |\mathbb{H}\widehat{J}\mathbf{w}_2|^2 \lesssim C(M)\frac{b^4}{|\mathrm{log} b|^2}. \tag{6.85}$$

Proof of Lemma 6.9:

step 1 Estimates for $\mathbf{w}_2$.

Oberve that

$$\mathcal{E}_2=\int |\mathbf{w}_0^2|^2, \ \ \mathcal{E}_4=\int |R_z\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}_2^0|^2=\int |\mathbb{A}^*\mathbf{w}_3|^2. \tag{6.86}$$

We then estimate from (6.45), (6.66), (6.47), (6.62):

$$\begin{aligned}\int |\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}|^2 &\lesssim \mathcal{E}_2+\int |\Delta\gamma|^2+\int \frac{1}{1+y^4}\left[|\partial_y\gamma|^2+|\partial_y\alpha|^2+\frac{|\alpha|^2}{y^2}\right]\\ &\lesssim \mathcal{E}_2+b^2|\mathrm{log} b|^2\end{aligned}$$

which yields (6.78). Now from (6.62):

$$\int |\mathbf{w}_2^1|^2 \lesssim \int \frac{|\partial_y\gamma|^2}{1+y^4}+\delta(b^*)\|\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim b^2|\mathrm{log} b|^2+\delta(b^*)\mathcal{E}_2$$

which together with (6.86) concludes the proof of (6.77).
From the explicit definition of $\mathbb{H}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\int \frac{|\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}|^2}{(1+y^4)(1+|\mathrm{log} y|^2)} &\lesssim \int \frac{|H\alpha|^2+|H\beta|^2+|\Delta\gamma|^2}{(1+y^4)(1+|\mathrm{log} y|^2)}+\int \frac{1}{1+y^8}\left[|\partial_y\gamma|^2+|\partial_y\alpha|^2+\frac{|\alpha|^2}{y^2}\right]\\ &\lesssim C(M)\mathcal{E}_4\end{aligned}$$

and (6.79) follows from (6.43) and (6.60). For (6.80) we simply observe

$$|\mathbf{w}_2^0|=|R_z\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}|\leq|\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}|.$$

On the other hand,

$$|\mathbf{w}_2^1|\leq|\widehat{\mathbf{w}}\wedge H\mathbf{w}|\lesssim|\widehat{\mathbf{w}}|\,|\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}|$$

and (6.81) follows from the bound $\|\widehat{\mathbf{w}}\|_{L^\infty}\leq\delta(b^*)$, see (6.49) and (6.64).

step 2 Estimates for $\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}_2$.

We now turn to the H^4 estimates (6.82) and (6.84). Recalling the decomposition (6.75) we first examine the quantity $\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}_2^0$:

$$|\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}_2^0|\leq|H^2\alpha|+|H^2\beta|+\frac{1}{1+y^2}(|\partial_yH\beta|+\frac{|H\beta|}{y})$$

The estimate

$$\int |\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}_2^0|^2\lesssim C(M)\mathcal{E}_4$$

now easily follow from the definition of $\mathcal{E}_4$, the coercivity bounds of Lemma 6.5. To obtain the improved bound for $\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}_2^0$ we simply note that

$$|R_z\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}_2^0| \leq |H^2\alpha| + |H^2\beta|$$

and

$$|\hat{\mathbf{w}} \wedge \mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}_2^0| \leq \delta(b^*)|H\mathbf{w}_2^0|$$

from which

$$\int |\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}_2^0|^2 \lesssim \mathcal{E}_4 + \frac{b^4}{|\log b|^2}$$

and thus (6.83) follows from the first part of (6.84).
We now claim:

$$\int |\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}_2^2|^2 \lesssim \delta(b^*)\left(\frac{b^4}{|\log b|^2} + \mathcal{E}_4\right). \tag{6.87}$$

Indeed, we compute:

$$\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}_2^2 = -2\left[H((1+Z)\partial_y\gamma)\right]e_y$$

and split the integral:

$$\int |\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}_2^2|^2 \leq \int_{y\leq 1} |\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}_2^2|^2 + \int_{y\geq 1} |\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}_2^2|^2.$$

The outer integral is easily estimated using the extra decay $|1+Z| \lesssim \frac{1}{1+y^2}$ and the estimates (6.60) of Lemma 6.8. For the inner integral, we use $|Z-1| \lesssim |y|^2$ to estimate:

$$\int_{y\leq 1} |\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}_2^2| \lesssim \int_{y\leq 1} |H\partial_y\gamma|^2 + \delta(b^*)\left(\frac{b^4}{|\log b|^2} + \mathcal{E}_4\right).$$

We then observe near the origin that for any function f:

$$Hf = -\partial_{yy}f - \frac{\partial_y}{y}f + \frac{1}{y^2}f + \frac{V-1}{y^2}f = -\partial_{yy}f + \frac{Af}{y} + \frac{V-1+Z-1}{y^2}f.$$

Since $|V-1| + |Z-1| \lesssim y^2$, the estimates of Lemma 6.8 imply:

$$\int_{y\leq 1} |\mathbb{H}\mathbf{w}_2^2|^2 \lesssim \int_{y\leq 1} \frac{|A\partial_y\gamma|^2}{y^2} + \delta(b^*)\left(\frac{b^4}{|\log b|^2} + \mathcal{E}_4\right).$$

The bound for the remaining term is given by (6.63).

step 3 Quadratic term.

We claim:

$$\int |\mathbb{H}(\widehat{\mathbf{w}} \wedge \mathbb{H}\mathbf{w})|^2 \lesssim \delta(b^*)\left(\frac{b^4}{|\log b|^2} + \mathcal{E}_4\right). \tag{6.88}$$

Indeed, first compute:

$$\widehat{\mathbf{w}} \wedge \mathbb{H}\mathbf{w} = \left|\begin{array}{l} \hat{\beta}\left[-\Delta\gamma + 2(1+Z)(\partial_y\alpha + \frac{Z}{y}\alpha)\right] - \hat{\gamma}H\beta \\ -\hat{\alpha}\left[-\Delta\gamma + 2(1+Z)(\partial_y\alpha + \frac{Z}{y}\alpha)\right] + \hat{\gamma}\left[H\alpha - 2(1+Z)\partial_y\gamma\right] \\ \hat{\alpha}H\beta - \hat{\beta}(H\alpha - 2(1+Z)\partial_y\gamma) \end{array}\right. \tag{6.89}$$

We now apply the $\mathbb{H}$ operator again and estimate all terms. We sketch the proof for the most delicate terms.

$$\int |H(\hat{\beta}\Delta\gamma)|^2 \lesssim \int |\Delta\gamma|^2|H\hat{\beta}|^2 + \int |\partial_y\Delta\gamma|^2|\partial_y\hat{\beta}|^2 + \int |\hat{\beta}|^2|\Delta^2\gamma|^2. \tag{6.90}$$

The last integral is the most delicate term estimated from (6.69). For the other terms, we estimate using (6.53), (6.67) and (6.68):

$$\begin{aligned}\int|\Delta\gamma|^2|H\hat{\beta}|^2 &\lesssim \|\Delta\gamma\|^2_{L^\infty(y\geq 1)}\int|H\hat{\beta}|^2+\|H\hat{\beta}\|^2_{L^\infty(y\leq 1)}\int_{y\leq 1}|\Delta\gamma|^2\\ &\lesssim b^2|\mathrm{log}b|^6b^3|\mathrm{log}b|^8+b^4b^2|\mathrm{log}b|^8\lesssim b^5.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since

$$\partial_y\Delta\gamma=\partial_y^3\gamma-\frac{1}{y}A\partial_y\gamma+\frac{Z-1}{y}\partial_y\gamma$$

and $|Z-1|\lesssim y^2$ we can estimate from (6.54), (6.60) and (6.63)

$$\int_{y\leq 1}|\partial_y\Delta\gamma|^2|\partial_y\hat{\beta}|^2\lesssim\|\partial_y\hat{\beta}\|_{L^\infty(y\leq 1)}\int_{y\leq 1}|\partial_y\Delta\gamma|^2\leq b^6.$$

For $y\geq 1$ we can interpolate between (6.68) and (6.69) to obtain

$$\int_{y\geq 1}|\partial_y\Delta\gamma|^2|\partial_y\hat{\beta}|^2\lesssim b^5||\mathrm{log}b|^C+b^{\frac{10}{3}}\|\partial_y\beta\|_{L^\infty(y\geq 1)}\leq b^5.$$

For the term involving the last coordinate in (6.89), we compute:

$$\begin{aligned}\int|\Delta(\hat{\alpha}H\beta)|^2 &\lesssim \int|\Delta\hat{\alpha}|^2|H\beta|^2+\int|\partial_y\hat{\alpha}|^2|\partial_yH\beta|^2+\int|\hat{\alpha}|^2|\Delta H\beta|^2\\ &\lesssim \int|\Delta\hat{\alpha}|^2|H\beta|^2+\int|\partial_y\hat{\alpha}|^2|\partial_yH\beta|^2+\int|\hat{\alpha}|^2\frac{|H\beta|^2}{y^4}+\delta(b^*)\mathcal{E}_4.\end{aligned}$$

Terms near the origin are easily estimated using Lemma 6.8. Far out, the first two terms are easily treated and for the third one, we estimate from (6.56):

$$\int_{y\geq 1}|\hat{\alpha}|^2\frac{|H\beta|^2}{y^4}\lesssim b^4|\mathrm{log}b|^C\sqrt{b}+\|\frac{\alpha}{1+y^2}\|^2_{L^\infty}\int|H\beta|^2\lesssim\delta(b^*)\frac{b^4}{|\mathrm{log}b|^2}$$

This concludes the proof of (6.88). The second part of (6.84) and (6.85) can be obtained in a similar fashion.
We omit the details.
This concludes the proof of Lemma 6.9.

Appendix C: Proof of Lemma 4.7

This Appendix is devoted to the proof of Lemma 4.7 which is the key to handle the quasilinear stucture of the problem. The proof is mostly algebraic and makes an implicit use of the interpolation estimates of Appendix B.

step 1 Gain of two derivatives.

Let

$$a=\alpha e_r+\beta e_\tau+\gamma Q,\quad \mathbf{\Gamma}=\left|\begin{array}{l}\alpha\\ \beta\\ \gamma\end{array}\right.$$

be a decomposition of the vector a relative to the Frenet basis of Q with $(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)=(\alpha(y),\beta(y),\gamma(y))$ functions of the radial variable y, and $\alpha^2+\beta^2+(1+\gamma)^2=1$. Then from (2.19):

$$\Delta a+|\nabla Q|^2a=-\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}. \tag{6.91}$$

We compute the action of derivatives

$$\partial_y a = \partial_y \mathbf{\Gamma} + M\mathbf{\Gamma}, \quad M\mathbf{\Gamma} := (1+Z)e_y \wedge \mathbf{\Gamma}, \tag{6.92}$$

$$\frac{1}{y}\partial_\theta a = N\mathbf{\Gamma}, \quad N\mathbf{\Gamma} := \left(\frac{Z}{y}e_z - (1+Z)e_x\right) \wedge \mathbf{\Gamma}.$$

We recall the double wedge formula:

$$a \wedge (b \wedge c) = (a\cdot c)b - (a\cdot b)c.$$

Let also

$$u = \widehat{\mathbf{w}} + e_z, \quad |u|^2 = 1.$$

be a unit vector. The proof of Lemma 4.7 is based on two computations. The first one relies on the action of the Laplace operator in the Frenet basis:

$$\int a\cdot u \wedge \Delta a = \int \Delta a \cdot (a \wedge u) = \int a \cdot \Delta(a\wedge u) = \int a \cdot [\Delta a \wedge u + 2\nabla a \wedge \nabla u]$$

and thus

$$\int a \cdot u \wedge \Delta a = \int a \cdot (\nabla a \wedge \nabla u). \tag{6.93}$$

We now compute from (6.91):

$$a\cdot [u \wedge \Delta a] = a \cdot \left[u \wedge (\Delta a + |\nabla Q|^2 a)\right] = -\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot[(e_z + \widehat{\mathbf{w}}) \wedge \mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}] = -\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}.$$

Hence from (6.92), (6.93):

$$\begin{aligned}
= & \int \mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot[(\partial_y\mathbf{\Gamma} + M\mathbf{\Gamma}) \wedge (\partial_y \widehat{\mathbf{w}} + M(e_z+\widehat{\mathbf{w}})) + N\mathbf{\Gamma}\wedge N(e_z + \widehat{\mathbf{w}})]\\
= & \int \mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot[\partial_y\mathbf{\Gamma} \wedge (\partial_y \widehat{\mathbf{w}} + M(e_z+\widehat{\mathbf{w}}))] + \int \mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot[M\mathbf{\Gamma} \wedge (\partial_y \widehat{\mathbf{w}} + M(e_z+\widehat{\mathbf{w}}))]\\
+ & \int \mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot[N\mathbf{\Gamma}\wedge N(e_z+\widehat{\mathbf{w}})].
\end{aligned}$$

The second computation uses the normalization of $\widehat{\mathbf{w}}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int \widehat{J}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot\left[\partial_y(\widehat{J}\mathbf{\Gamma}) \wedge \partial_y\widehat{\mathbf{w}}\right] &= \int \widehat{J}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot[(\partial_y\widehat{\mathbf{w}}\wedge\mathbf{\Gamma} + (e_z+\widehat{\mathbf{w}})\wedge\partial_y\mathbf{\Gamma})\wedge\partial_y\widehat{\mathbf{w}}]\\
&= -\int\left[(\partial_y\widehat{\mathbf{w}}\cdot\mathbf{\Gamma})(\partial_y\widehat{\mathbf{w}}\cdot\widehat{J}\mathbf{\Gamma})\right]
\end{aligned}$$

and the structure of the operator M:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int \widehat{J}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot\left[\partial_y(\widehat{J}\mathbf{\Gamma})\wedge(M(e_z+\widehat{\mathbf{w}}))\right]\\
= & \int \widehat{J}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot[(\partial_y\widehat{\mathbf{w}}\wedge\mathbf{\Gamma} + (e_z+\widehat{\mathbf{w}})\wedge\partial_y\mathbf{\Gamma})\wedge(M(e_z+\widehat{\mathbf{w}}))]\\
= & \int \widehat{J}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot[(\partial_y\widehat{\mathbf{w}}\wedge\mathbf{\Gamma})\wedge(M(e_z+\widehat{\mathbf{w}}))].
\end{aligned}$$

This generates a two derivatives gain:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\cdot\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}) = -\int \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\cdot\Big[\partial_y(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma})\wedge(\partial_y\widehat{\mathbf{w}}+M(e_z+\widehat{\mathbf{w}})\Big]\\
- &\int \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{A}\cdot\Big[M\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\wedge(\partial_y\widehat{\mathbf{w}}+M(e_z+\widehat{\mathbf{w}})\Big] - \int \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\cdot\Big[N\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\wedge N(e_z+\widehat{\mathbf{w}})\Big]\\
= &\int(\partial_y\widehat{\mathbf{w}}\cdot\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma})(\partial_y\widehat{\mathbf{w}}\cdot\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}) - \int\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\cdot[(\partial_y\widehat{\mathbf{w}}\wedge\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma})\wedge(M(e_z+\widehat{\mathbf{w}}))]\\
- &\int \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\cdot\Big[M\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\wedge(\partial_y\widehat{\mathbf{w}}+M(e_z+\widehat{\mathbf{w}}))\Big] - \int \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\cdot\Big[N\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\wedge N(e_z+\widehat{\mathbf{w}})\Big].
\end{aligned}
$$

We now observe from

$$Me_z=(1+Z)e_x,\quad Ne_z=(1+Z)e_y$$

the cancellation:

$$
\begin{aligned}
- &\int \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\cdot\Big[M\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\wedge Me_z\Big] - \int \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\cdot\Big[N\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\wedge Ne_z\Big]\\
= &-\int \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\cdot\left[(1+Z)^2(e_y\wedge\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma})\wedge e_x+\left((\frac{Z}{y}e_z-(1+Z)e_x)\wedge\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\right)\wedge(1+Z)e_y\right]\\
= &\int \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\cdot\left[(1+Z)^2(e_x\cdot\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma})e_y+(1+Z)\left((e_y\cdot\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma})\frac{Z}{y}e_z-(1+Z)(e_y\cdot\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma})e_x\right)\right]\\
= &\int\frac{Z(1+Z)}{y}(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\cdot e_y)(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\cdot e_z).
\end{aligned}
$$

We have thus arrived at the formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\cdot\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}) \qquad (6.94)\\
= &\int(\partial_y\widehat{\mathbf{w}}\cdot\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma})(\partial_y\widehat{\mathbf{w}}\cdot\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}) - \int\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\cdot\Big[(\partial_y\widehat{\mathbf{W}}\wedge\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma})\wedge(M(e_z+\widehat{\mathbf{w}}))\Big]\\
- &\int \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\cdot\Big[M\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\wedge(\partial_y\widehat{\mathbf{w}}+M\widehat{\mathbf{w}})\Big]\\
+ &\int\frac{Z(1+Z)}{y}(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\cdot e_y)(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\cdot e_z) - \int \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\cdot\Big[N\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}\wedge N\widehat{\mathbf{w}}\Big].
\end{aligned}
$$

step 2 Leading order b term.

Let us write

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}=\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0+\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_1,\quad \widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0=b\tilde{T}_1e_y.$$

We compute:

$$M\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0=0,\quad N\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0=-b\tilde{T}_1\left(\frac{Z}{y}e_x+(1+Z)e_z\right).$$

This yields in particular the cancellation:

$$N\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0\cdot\left(-(1+Z)e_x+\frac{Z}{y}e_z\right)=0.$$

We now compute the leading order contribution of $\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0$ to (6.94). First,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int \frac{Z(1+Z)}{y}(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot e_y)(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot e_z) = \int \frac{Z(1+Z)}{y}(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot e_y)\left[((\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0+\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_1+\mathbf{w})\wedge\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma})\cdot e_z\right]\\
= & \int \frac{Z(1+Z)}{y}(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot e_y)[-b\tilde{T}_1(\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot e_x)] + O\left(\left\|\frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_1+\mathbf{w}}{y(1+y^2)}\right\|_{L^\infty}\|\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\|_{L^2}^2\right)\\
= & -b\int \frac{Z(1+Z)}{y}\tilde{T}_1(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot e_y)^2 + O\left(\left[\left\|\frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_1+\mathbf{w}}{y(1+y^2)}\right\|_{L^\infty} + \left\|\frac{b\tilde{T}_1|\widehat{\mathbf{w}}|}{y(1+y)}\right\|_{L^\infty}\right]\|\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\|_{L^2}^2\right)\\
= & -b\int \frac{Z(1+Z)}{y}\tilde{T}_1(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot e_y)^2 + O\left(b\delta(b^*)\|\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\|_{L^2}^2\right)
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the estimates of Lemma 6.7. Next:

$$\begin{aligned}
- & \int \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot\left[M\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\wedge\partial_y\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0 + N\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\wedge N\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0\right]\\
= & \; b\int \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot\left[(1+Z)\partial_y\tilde{T}_1 e_y\wedge(e_y\wedge\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}) + N\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0\wedge\left((-(1+Z)e_x+\frac{Z}{y}e_z)\wedge\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\right)\right]\\
= & \; b\int(1+Z)\partial_y\tilde{T}_1\left[(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot e_y)^2 - \|\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\|^2\right]\\
+ & \; b\int\tilde{T}_1\left[(-(1+Z)(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot e_x)+\frac{Z}{y}(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot e_z))(-\frac{Z}{y}(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot e_x)-(1+Z)(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot e_z))\right]\\
= & \; b\int(1+Z)A\tilde{T}_1(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot e_x)^2\\
+ & \; b\int(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{A}\cdot e_z)\left[-(1+Z)(\partial_y\tilde{T}_1+\frac{Z}{y}\tilde{T}_1)(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot e_z)+\tilde{T}_1((1+Z)^2-\frac{Z^2}{y^2})(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot e_x)\right]\\
= & \; b\int(1+Z)A\tilde{T}_1(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot e_x)^2 + O\left(b\left\|(\frac{|\partial_y\tilde{T}_1}{1+y^2}+\frac{|\tilde{T}_1|}{y^2})|\mathbf{w}|\right\|_{L^\infty}\|\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\|_{L^2}^2\right)\\
= & \; b\int(1+Z)A\tilde{T}_1(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot e_x)^2 + O\left(b\delta(b^*)\|\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\|_{L^2}^2\right),
\end{aligned}$$

thanks to Lemma 6.7. Next,

$$\begin{aligned}
- & \int \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot[(\partial_y\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_0\wedge\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma})\wedge Me_z] = -b\int(1+Z)\partial_y\tilde{T}_1\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot[(e_y\wedge\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma})\wedge e_x]\\
= & \; b\int(1+Z)\partial_y\tilde{T}_1(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot e_y)(\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot e_x)\\
= & \; b\int(1+Z)\partial_y\tilde{T}_1(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot e_y)\left((\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot e_y)-(\widehat{\mathbf{w}}\wedge\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma})\cdot e_y\right)\\
= & \; b\int(1+Z)\partial_y\tilde{T}_1(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot e_y)^2 + O\left(\|b(1+Z)\partial_y\tilde{T}_1 w\|_{L^\infty}\|\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\|_{L^2}^2\right)\\
= & \; b\int(1+Z)\partial_y\tilde{T}_1(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot e_y)^2 + O\left(b\delta(b^*)\|\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\|_{L^2}^2\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we obtained

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma} \cdot \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}) = b\int (1+Z)A\tilde{T_1}\left[(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot e_x)^2 - (\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\cdot e_y)^2\right] \\
+ \quad & \int (\partial_y \widehat{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma})(\partial_y \widehat{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}) - \int \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma} \cdot [(\partial_y(\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_1 + \mathbf{w}) \wedge \mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}) \wedge (M(e_z + \widehat{\mathbf{w}}))] \\
- \quad & \int \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma} \cdot \left[M\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma} \wedge (\partial_y \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{+}\partial_y \mathbf{w} + M(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1 + \mathbf{w})\right] \\
- \quad & \int \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma} \cdot \left[N\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma} \wedge N(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1 + \mathbf{w})\right] \\
+ \quad & O\left(b\delta(b^*)\|\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\|_{L^2}^2\right). \qquad (6.95)
\end{aligned}
$$

step 3 Upper bound on the quadratic term.

We now claim that

$$\forall y \geq 0, \quad 0 \leq (1+Z)A\tilde{T_1} \leq 1 - d_1 \qquad (6.96)$$

for some universal constant

$$0 < d_1 < 1.$$

We prove the inequality for T_1, the claim for $\tilde{T_1}$ follows immediately. From

$$\frac{(\Lambda\phi)'}{\Lambda\phi} = \frac{Z}{y},$$

there holds:

$$A^*(AT_1) = \frac{1}{y\Lambda\phi}\frac{\partial}{\partial y}(y\Lambda\phi AT_1) = \Lambda\phi$$

and thus,

$$AT_1 = \frac{1}{y\Lambda\phi}\int_0^y \tau(\Lambda\phi)^2 d\tau.$$

Now

$$1 + Z = \frac{2}{1+y^2} = \frac{\Lambda\phi}{y}.$$

Therefore,

$$J(y) = (1+Z)A(T_1) = \frac{1}{y^2}\int_0^y \tau(\Lambda\phi)^2 d\tau \geq 0. \qquad (6.97)$$

Let now

$$f(y) = \int_0^y \tau(\Lambda\phi)^2 d\tau - y^2,$$

then

$$f'(y) = y(\Lambda\phi)^2 - 2y = \frac{4y^3}{(1+y^2)^2} - 2y = \frac{1}{y}\left[4y^3 - 2y(1+2y^2+y^4)\right] \leq 0$$

and thus

$$f(y) < f(0) = 0 \ \text{ for } \ y > 0.$$

Hence $J(y) < 1$ for $y > 0$. Now $J(y) \to 0$ as $y \to +\infty$. It therefore attains its maximum at some $y_0 \geq 0$ with $J(y_0) < 1$, unless $y_0 = 0$ which is ruled out since $J(0) = 0$, and (6.96) is proved.

step 4 Conclusion.

To control the remaining nonlinear terms in (6.95) we use the estimates of Lemma 6.7. The first three terms are easily controlled:

$$\left|\int (\partial_y \widehat{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma})(\partial_y \widehat{\mathbf{w}} \cdot \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma})\right| \lesssim \|\partial_y \widehat{\mathbf{w}}\|_{L^\infty}^2 \|\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\|_{L^2}^2 \lesssim b\delta(b^*)\|\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\|_{L^2}^2,$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\int \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma} \cdot [(\partial_y(\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_1 + \mathbf{w}) \wedge \mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}) \wedge (M(e_z + \widehat{\mathbf{w}}))]\right| & \lesssim \left\|\frac{|\partial_y \widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_1| + |\partial_y \mathbf{w}|}{1+y^2}\right\|_{L^\infty} \|\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ & \lesssim b\delta(b^*)\|\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left|\int \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma} \cdot \left[M\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma} \wedge (\partial_y \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_+ \partial_y \mathbf{w} + M(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1 + \mathbf{w})\right]\right| \\ \lesssim & \left[\left\|\frac{|\partial_y \widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_1| + |\partial_y \mathbf{w}|}{1+y^2}\right\|_{L^\infty} + \left\|\frac{|\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_1| + |\mathbf{w}|}{1+y^4}\right\|_{L^\infty}\right] \|\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ \lesssim & \ b\delta(b^*)\|\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The last term requires an additional cancellation to handle a singularity at the origin. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} - & \int \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma} \cdot \left[N\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma} \wedge N(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1 + \mathbf{w})\right] = \int N\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma} \cdot \left[\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma} \wedge N(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1 + \mathbf{w})\right] \\ = & \int (\frac{Z}{y}e_z - (1+Z)e_x) \wedge \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma} \cdot \left[\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma} \wedge \left[(\frac{Z}{y}e_z - (1+Z)e_x) \wedge (\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1 + \mathbf{w})\right]\right] \\ = & \int \frac{Z^2}{y^2} e_z \wedge \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma} \cdot \left[\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma} \wedge [e_z \wedge (\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1 + \mathbf{w})]\right] + O\left(\left\|\frac{|\mathbf{w}_1| + |\mathbf{w}|}{y(1+y^2)}\right\|_{L^\infty} \|\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\|_{L^2}^2\right) \\ = & -\int \frac{Z^2}{y^2} e_z \wedge \widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma} \cdot \left[(\widehat{J}\mathbb{H}\mathbf{A} \cdot e_z)(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}_1 + \mathbf{w})\right] + O\left(b\delta(b^*)\|\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\|_{L^2}^2\right) \\ = & \left(\left\|\frac{|\mathbf{w}|(|\mathbf{w}_1| + |\mathbf{w}|)}{y^2}\right\|_{L^\infty} \|\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\|_{L^2}^2\right) + O\left(b\delta(b^*)\|\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\|_{L^2}^2\right) \\ \lesssim & \ O\left(b\delta(b^*)\|\mathbb{H}\mathbf{\Gamma}\|_{L^2}^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

Combining these estimates together with (6.96) and (6.95) concludes the proof of (4.49) and of Lemma 4.7.

References

[1] Angenent, S.B.; Hulshof, J.; Matano, H., The radius of vanishing bubbles in equivariant harmonic map flow from D^2 to $\mathbb{S}^2$, SIAM J. Math. Anal, vol 41, no 3, pp 1121-1137.

[2] Van den Bergh, J.; Hulshof, J.; King, J., Formal asymptotics of bubbling in the harmonic map heat flow, SIAM J. Appl. Math. vol 63, o5. pp 1682-1717.

[3] Bizon, P.; Chmaj, T.; Tabor, Z., Formation of singularities for equivariant $(2+1)$-dimensional wave maps into the 2-sphere. Nonlinearity 14 (2001), no. 5, 1041–1053.

[4] Bizon, P.; Ovchinnikov, Y. N.; Sigal, I. M., Collapse of an instanton. Nonlinearity 17 (2004), no. 4, 1179–1191.

[5] Bourgain, J.; Wang, W., Construction of blowup solutions for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation with critical nonlinearity, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4) **25** (1997), no. 1-2, 197-215.

[6] Bejenaru, I.; Ionescu, A.; Kenig, C.; Tataru, D., Global Schrödinger maps, to appear in Annals of Math..

[7] Bejenaru, I.; Tataru, D., Near soliton evolution for equivariant Schrödinger Maps in two spatial dimensions, arXiv:1009.1608.

[8] Bogomol'nyi, E.B., The stability of classical solutions. Soviet J. Nuclear Phys. **24** (1976), no. 4, 449–454 (Russian).

[9] Chang, N-H.; Shatah, J.; Uhlenbeck, K., Schrödinger maps, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 53 (2000), no 5, 590-602.

[10] Ding, W.Y., On the Schrödinger flows, Proceedings of the International congress of Mathematicians, vol II, (Beijing 2002), 282-291.

[11] Grillakis, M.; Stefanopoulos, V., Lagrangian formulation, energy estimates and the Schödinger map prolem, Comm PDE 27 (2002), 1845-1877

[12] Grotowski, J.; Shatah, J. Geometric evolution equations in critical dimensions. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 30 (2007), no. 4, 499-512.

[13] Gustafson, S.; Kang, K.; Tsai, T-P.; Schrödinger flow near harmonic maps; Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 60 (2007), no. 4, 463-499.

[14] Gustafson, S.; Kang, K.; Tsai, T-P.; Asymptotic stability of harmonic maps under the Schrödinger flow.; Duke Math. J. 145 no. 3 (2008) 537-583.

[15] Gustafson, S.; Nakanishi, K.; Tsai, T-P.; Asymptotic stability, concentration and oscillations in harmonic map heat flow, Landau Lifschitz and Schrödinger maps on $\mathbb{R}^2$; Comm. Math. Phys. (2010), 300, no 1, 205-242.

[16] Hillairet, M.; Raphael, P., Smooth type II blow up solutions to the four dimensional energy critical wave equation, arXiv:1010.1768.

[17] Kosevitch, A.; Ivanov, B.; Kovalev, A.; Magnetic solitons, Phys Rev 194 (1990), 117-238.

[18] Krieger, J.: Martel,Y.; Raphaël, P., Two solitons solution to the gravitational Hartree equation, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 62 (2009), no. 11, 1501–1550.

[19] Krieger, J.; Schlag, W., Non-generic blow-up solutions for the critical focusing NLS in 1-D, J. Eur. Math. Soc. 11 (2009), no. 1, 1Ð125.

[20] Krieger, J.; Schlag, W.; Concentration compactness for critical wave maps; Preprint, 2009.

[21] Krieger, J.; Schlag, W.; Tataru, D. Renormalization and blow up for charge one equivariant critical wave maps. Invent. Math. 171 (2008), no. 3, 543–615.

[22] Manton, N.; Sutcliffe, P. Topological solitons. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

[23] Merle, F.; Raphaël, P., Blow up dynamic and upper bound on the blow up rate for critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation, Ann. Math. 161 (2005), no. 1, 157–222.

[24] Merle, F.; Raphaël, P., Sharp upper bound on the blow up rate for critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation, Geom. Funct. Anal. 13 (2003), 591-642.

[25] Merle, F.; Raphaël, P., On universality of blow up profile for L^2 critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation, Invent. Math. 156, 565-672 (2004).

[26] Merle, F.; Raphaël, P., Sharp lower bound on the blow up rate for critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 19 (2006), no. 1, 37–90.

[27] Merle, F.; Raphaël, P., Profiles and quantization of the blow up mass for critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation, Comm. Math. Phys. 253 (2005), no. 3, 675–704.

[28] Merle, F.; Raphaël, P.; Szeftel, J., The instability of Bourgain Wang solutions for the L^2 critical NLS, arXiv:1010.5168.

[29] Perelman, G., On the formation of singularities in solutions of the critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation. Ann. Henri Poincaré 2 (2001), no. 4, 605–673.

[30] Qing, J.; On singularities of the heat flow for harmonic maps from surfaces into spheres, Comm. Anal. Geom. 3 (1995), 297-315.

[31] Qing J.; Tian G.; Bubbling of the heat flows for harmonic maps from surface, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 50 (1997), 295-310.

[32] Raphaël, P., *Stability of the log-log bound for blow up solutions to the critical non linear Schrödinger equation*, Math. Ann. 331 (2005), no. 3, 577–609.

[33] Raphaël, P.; Rodnianksi, I., Stable blow up dynamics for the critical corotational wave maps and equivariant Yang Mills problems, to appear in Prep. Math. IHES.

[34] Raphaël, P.; Schweyer, R., Stable blow up dynamics for the 1-corotational heat flow, preprint 2011.

[35] Raphaël, P.; Szeftel, J., Existence and uniqueness of minimal blow up solutions to an inhomogeneous mass critical NLS equation, to appear in Jour. Amer. Math. Soc.

[36] Shatah, J.; Tahvildar-Zadeh, A. Regularity of harmonic maps from the Minkowski space into rotationally symmetric manifolds. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 45 (1992), no. 8, 947–971.

[37] Rodnianski, I., Sterbenz, J., On the formation of singularities in the critical $O(3)$ σ-model; Ann. of Math. (2) 172 (2010), no. 1, 187-242.

[38] Smith, P.; Conditional global regularity of Schrödinger maps: sub-threshold dispersed energy; Preprint 2010.

[39] Sterbenz, J.; Tataru, D.; Regularity of Wave-Maps in dimension $2 + 1$; Comm. Math. Phys. (298) (2009), 139-230.

[40] Sulem, P.L; Sulem, C.; Bardos, C., On the continuous limit for a system of continuous spins, Comm. Math. Phys 107 (1986), no 3, 431-454.

[41] Struwe, M., On the evolution of harmonic mappings of Riemannian surfaces, Comment. Math. Helv. 60 (1985), no. 4, 558Ð581.

[42] Struwe, M., Equivariant wave maps in two space dimensions. Dedicated to the memory of J§rgen K. Moser. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 56 (2003), no. 7, 815–823.

[43] Tao, T.; Global regularity of wave maps III-VII, Preprints 2008-2009.

[44] Topping, P.M.; Winding behaviour of finite-time singularities of the harmonic map heat flow; Math. Z. 247 (2004).

Université de Cergy Pontoise and IHES, France
E-mail address: `merle@math.u-cergy.fr`

IMT, Université Toulouse III, France
E-mail address: `pierre.raphael@math.univ-toulouse.fr`

Mathematics Department, Princeton University, USA
E-mail address: `irod@math.princeton.edu`